The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXIV, No. 4 April, 1946

CONTENTS

How Should Priests Direct People Regarding the Movies? *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 241
The Cultural Mission of the Church *Edmond Darvil Benard* 254
The Living Word . . . . . . *Walter Greene* 261
The Teaching of Theology to the Laity *Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P.* 266
The Way of the Cross and the Blessed Sacrament *Malachy J. Donnelly, S.J.* 278
The True Church and the Notes of the Church *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 282

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Faculties Concerning Holy Week for Our Armed Forces 298
Holy Thursday Repository or Sepulchre 299
The Extraordinary Reverences to the Holy Oils on Holy Thursday 300
The "Churching" of Several Women Together 301
St. Paul and Sexagesima Sunday 302
Loot from Abroad 303

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1946, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

ANALECTA 305

BOOK REVIEWS

Pillars of the Church, *by Theodore Maynard* 309

Further Discourses on the Holy Ghost, *by Lester M. Dooley* . 310

Note Storico-Bibliografiche di Archeologia Cristiana *by Msgr. B. Ferretto* 311

Speech Models. Effective Construction and Expression, *selected and edited by William R. Duffey and Aloysius Croft* 313

Christian Denominations, *by Konrad Algermissen* 314

Travail scientifique en disciplines ecclésiastiques, *by Gérard Yelle, S.S.* 314

The Seven Sorrows of Mary, *by Gerard M. Corr, O.S.M.* 316

Difficulties in Mental Prayer, *by Fr. Eugene Boylan, O.Cist.R.* 317

The Life of Our Lord *by Sisters Jane Marie, O.P., and Anne Catherine, C.S.J.* 318

BOOK NOTES 319

BOOKS RECEIVED 320

A *Valuable* Compendium for Every Priest

"*Instructions* of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments on the Rules to be Followed by the Pastor in Making the Canonical Inquiries before He Permits the *Marriage Couple* to Enter *Matrimony*."

A complete and detailed exposition of Canon 1020 together with Appendix Giving Questionnaires of the Instructions.

Fifteen cents per copy

The Catholic University of America Press
620 Michigan Avenue, N. E.
Washington 17, D. C.

HOW SHOULD PRIESTS DIRECT PEOPLE REGARDING THE MOVIES?

The motion picture has become an integral and influential factor of modern life, particularly in the United States. Thousands of theaters throughout our land open their doors daily to the patrons of the silver screen, of all ages and of all social and intellectual grades. The number of persons who attend the movies averages more than twelve million every day. The amount of money spent at the cinema in 1945 was $1,714,500,000—more than four million dollars daily.[1] The production and the distribution of motion pictures has become one of the biggest industries in our country; the heroes and the heroines of the screen outrank governors and university presidents in fame and in salary.

The influence of the movies on the moral concepts of many of the spectators is unquestionably very powerful. No one can concentrate his attention for two or three hours on a swift-moving succession of scenes presenting most vividly the powerful operation of human passion or the tense struggle between good and evil without being emotionally affected or even induced to form intellectual judgments on ethical subjects. This is especially true in the case of those whose knowledge of moral principles is meager or who are of impressionable character, particularly adolescents.[2]

The moral evil effected by bad movies is thus described by Pope Pius XI: "Everyone knows what damage is done to the soul by bad motion pictures. They are occasions of sin; they seduce young people along the ways of evil by glorifying the passions; they show life under a false light; they cloud ideals; they destroy pure love, respect for marriage and affection for the family. They are capable also of creating prejudices among individuals, misunderstandings among nations, among social classes and among entire races."[3]

---

[1] *Brooklyn Tablet,* Jan. 19, 1946.

[2] The extent of the influence exerted by the movies on the moral life of our people, particularly of the young, and the moral status of the screen at the present time are subjects of controversy. Some believe that motion pictures are contributing much toward the lowering of ethical standards in our day, and assert that there is much improvement still to be desired, even in pictures classified as A2. Others contend that there is no proof that the movies are causing much moral harm, and claim that there has been considerable improvement in the moral tone of the screen during the past decade. I should be glad to hear the views of the readers on these questions.

Priests, charged with the duty of instructing and guiding the faithful in the way of virtue, cannot be unmindful of the part which the movies are playing in shaping the moral concepts of their flock and in influencing their conduct. The problem of counselling Catholics correctly about attendance at the movies cannot be solved by telling them to stay away from motion pictures entirely, any more than the problem of drunkenness was solved a generation ago by the prohibition amendment. Whatever our personal ideas may be about the advisability of attending the movies, we must start off with the assumption that most of our people are going to see a motion picture show at least once or twice a month, and that instead of orating against the movies in general, we would do better by giving them some positive guidance so that they may not suffer spiritual harm but may rather profit by the cinema, as far as possible.

The Legion of Decency, formally established in April, 1934, is the Catholic organization directed to protect the morals of Catholics at the cinema. The Legion is headed by a committee of five bishops. The present committee is made up of Bishop Keough (Chairman), Archbishop Cantwell, Bishops Albers, McEntegart, and Scully. Since Feb., 1936, the responsibility for the review and censorship of films has been in the care of the Archdiocese of New York. The Motion Picture department of the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae has been designated as the reviewing and classifying group for the Legion of Decency.[4] Once a year, within the octave of the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, the Catholics of the United States are requested to make a public promise that they will form a right conscience about pictures, that they will stay away from pictures which are dangerous to their moral life, etc. The activity of the Legion of Decency and the custom of making the annual pledge were warmly praised by Pope Pius XI: "Millions of American Catholics signed the pledge of the Legion of Decency, binding themselves not to attend any motion picture which was offensive to Catholic moral principles or to the proper standards of living. We were thus able to proclaim joyfully that few problems of these latter times have so closely united the Bishops and the people as the one resolved by co-operation in this holy crusade."[5]

---

[3] *Vigilanti cura, AAS,* XXVIII (1936), 255; N.C.W.C. translation, p. 9.

[4] Cf. *Franciscan Almanac,* 1946, pp. 393-94.

However, like all movements ordained to beneficial effects on a large scale, the Legion of Decency cannot attain its objectives adequately unless Catholics as a group—particularly the clergy—contribute their active and constant co-operation. Now, it is an undeniable fact that some priests collaborate with the Legion of Decency in only a very limited measure. There are not a few parishes in our land where the pastor's activity in this matter consists in leading the people once a year in pronouncing the pledge of the Legion of Decency and in occasionally warning them, in a general way, to stay away from bad movies. There is no further explanation as to which classes of movies should be avoided, no special admonitions or instructions for the young, no effort to fashion the taste of the people so that they can themselves perceive why certain types of pictures are good or bad.

Undoubtedly, this state of affairs is often due to the fact that the pastor feels he has no means of knowing just what norms should be followed in determining whether a certain person should or should not be allowed to see a certain picture. He knows that according to the classification of the Legion of Decency there are three classes of movies, known as A, B, and C. Class A comprises two sections—those regarded as unobjectionable for general patronage and those considered unobjectionable for adults. Class B contains pictures objectionable in part; Class C, pictures that are condemned without any qualification. But many pastors feel incapable of giving a definite and correct answer when confronted with such questions as: When may persons attend class B pictures? May children go to pictures ranked as unobjectionable for adults? How often should children be allowed to go to the movies? What positive help can priests give toward improving the movies? The purpose of this article is to make some suggestions that may assist priests in the ministry to solve these problems.

I.

The reason why some films are classified as B pictures—objectionable in part—is that they present in a manner that is too attractive or as defensible such crimes as suicide or dishonesty or divorce. In about half the cases the objection is based on portions of these pictures that are likely to arouse the sensual passions of the audience—ardent love-scenes, indecent dress, licentious dances, etc. The greater part of such a picture, however, is judged to be safe for the average person (at least the average adult), and may even contain some very inspiring scenes.

---

[5] *Vigilanti cura, AAS,* XXVIII (1936), 252; N.C.W.C. translation, p. 5.

The most difficult moral problem in connection with the movies centers about the lawfulness of attending a B picture. It is a problem that cannot be settled by a general answer—each individual case must be considered. To understand this point we must bear in mind that occasions of sin are, to a certain measure, relative. Accordingly, a particular picture might be a proximate occasion of sin to one person, whereas to another it would be only a remote occasion or no occasion at all. For example, a Catholic who is endowed with an intelligent and adequate grasp of the Church's teachings could see a picture in with divorce is portrayed as something justifiable without injury to his faith or morals; whereas one who lacks such understanding might be induced by the same picture to wonder if perhaps the Church's stand on divorce is not too strict. Some persons of advanced age could witness a representation of passionate love-making without any other emotion than a feeling of disgust, while the same scene might incite grave temptations in adolescents. Married persons might safely witness scenes that would be very dangerous to the unmarried.

With these facts in mind, we can perceive the significance of the B classification of certain pictures. These contain scenes or dialogue that would be very dangerous to the faith or morals of some persons, but not of others. From this standpoint, the reply to a person who wishes his conscience settled in the matter of attending a certain movie would be conditional: "If the picture is a proximate occasion of sin for you, it would be a sin for you to see it; if it is not such an occasion, it would not be a sin—at least not a grave sin." And it would be well to add that those to whom a picture would be a proximate occasion of grave sin would commit a mortal sin by attending. Furthermore, when the board of censorship rate a picture as objectionable in part, they are presumed to mean that it is likely to lead some persons into *grave* sin (not merely venial sin), so that for such persons to attend would be seriously wrong.[6] And by "some persons" is meant, not merely a small number of abnormal individuals, but a notable proportion of average people.

The question would naturally arise whether a Catholic is bound to find out the classification of a picture before going to see it. The answer is undoubtedly in the affirmative. It is a moral principle that when there is a probable danger of formal sin the safer side must be followed;[7] and in considering the number of objectionable pictures on the screen today, there is always a probability, by the law of averages, that a picture to which one goes without making an investigation as to its moral aspect is at least partially objectionable and probably dangerous to his spiritual welfare. The most practical way to acquire this information is to consult the list issued by the Legion of Decency, which is available in diocesan papers—and, if the pastor is anxious to keep his people enlightened on these matters, it will be found in the vestibule of the church or of the parish hall. There is no strict obligation in obedience to follow the Legion's decisions; yet ordinarily it would be imprudent to disregard them, for the classification is carefully made by persons of long experience and mature judgment. Another (though less satisfactory) method of obtaining the requisite information about the moral quality of a picture would be to inquire about this matter from a reliable person who has himself seen the picture. Still another method might be to limit one's attendance to theaters that follow the policy of showing only pictures that are above reproach—that is, those which would be classified as A pictures.[8]

---

[6] Cf. Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis* (Paris, 1938), I, n. 177. It should be noted that the principle that a person commits a grave sin by exposing himself to the proximate occasion of grave sin admits of the qualification "unless he has a just and proportionately grave reason to expose himself to this danger." In the text this qualification has not been introduced, because in practice a sufficient reason is hardly ever present to justify a person in going to see a movie that is a proximate occasion of sin to him. The qualification could be applied to an official censor, who must pass judgment on all kinds of pictures. Such a person, when required to see a picture that constitutes for him a proximate occasion of sin, must render the occasion remote, particularly by the help of prayer.

[7] Cf. Aertnys-Damen, *Theologia moralis* (Rome, 1939), I, n. 99.

[8] Such theatres, if they exist at all, are very rare. Even the Radio City Music Hall, though usually reliable, sometimes shows pictures that are partially objectionable.

The chief point to be remembered is that before going to see a picture a person must have reasonable positive assurance that it will not be dangerous to his spiritual welfare. His attitude must be: "I may not see a picture unless I have good reason to believe that it is not harmful to me," not, "I am allowed to see a picture unless I have good reason to believe that it is harmful to me." I would not hesitate to preach to Catholics that the average person who is in the habit of going to the movies frequently and who neglects to inquire about the moral aspect of the pictures he attends will eventually be guilty of a grave sin of imprudence, because on some occasions he will very likely put himself in the proximate danger of mortal sin without any justifying reason. It would seem that to attend a picture on a single occasion without inquiring about its character would be only a venial sin, since in that event one would be putting himself in only the slightly probable danger of grave sin.[9]

Presuming that one has discovered that a picture which he wishes to attend is listed in the B classification, the question arises whether or not it constitutes for him individually a proximate danger of sin. This is not easy to decide. For, in the first place, it is not easy to decide why the picture has been put in the B classification, and of course this would be an important factor in solving the problem of conscience. Some who would be endangered by a sensuous scene would suffer no spiritual risk from a picture that would glorify suicide, and vice versa. At any rate, it seems that once a person has good reason to believe that a picture is objectionable in part, or is morally dangerous to some persons (whether he obtain this information from the Legion of Decency's list or from some other reliable source), he would not be permitted to see it until he has sufficient guarantee that he individually will not be harmed by it. In other words, presumption favors the prohibition of not attending; the burden of proof rests on the individual to prove that he may attend without grave danger. This is especially true in respect to pictures put on the B list because of sensuous scenes; for this list has been drawn up relatively to the average adult, so that a person would have to prove that he is morally stronger than the average adult before he can lawfully chance seeing the picture. For one to see such a picture without some assurance that he will not run the risk of committing a grave sin would seem to be so hazardous that it can reasonably be regarded as itself a mortal sin.

---

[9] Cf. Merkelbach, *op. cit.*, I, n. 177, 3.

Evidently, then, one contemplating attendance at a B picture must have some knowledge of the particular danger it involves and a just appreciation of his own moral strength. Information on the former point could be acquired from accounts or reviews of the picture in the newspapers or periodicals, from the comments of those who have seen it, from the reasons appended to the B classification by the Legion of Decency. The Legion of Decency, in its first classification of a B picture, gives the reason for its unfavorable judgment, but not in subsequent lists. It would be desirable if every list contained such a statement, at least in the form of a code number, referring to a particular category. As to the ability to see the picture without grave danger, a person might make a fair judgment of his own moral strength and weakness based on his inclinations, his intellectual development, his past experience, etc., but the safer course would be to submit the problem to his confessor, particularly if the latter is fully familiar with the moral qualifications and traits of character of the penitent. All this may seem like a very difficult and complicated process, especially to those who are accustomed to attend a picture without giving the matter a second thought,[10] but it seems to be the only solution that can be logically drawn from Catholic theological principles.

Furthermore, another factor must be considered when there is question of a person going to see a picture that constitutes a proximate occasion of sin to some—the danger of scandal. Even though the individual himself may be in no danger, his presence may lead others to attend who will be disastrously affected by the picture. This point is especially applicable to parents with reference to their sons and daughters and to persons commonly regarded as exemplary members of the community. When Mr. X, a devout Catholic, is known by his friends to go to B pictures occasionally, it is quite likely that they will conclude that they themselves may go to such pictures as often as they wish, without doing any wrong—failing to take into account that what may be no occasion of sin to Mr. X may be a grave danger to them. In such circumstances Mr. X would be guilty of the sin of scandal—objectively a grave sin, it would seem.[11]

---

[10] Unfortunately, there are some Catholics of this type.

[11] Another argument against attendance at partially objectionable pictures

In view of this last point, it is hard to see how a priest could ever attend a B picture publicly without giving grave scandal, even though he himself would not thereby suffer the least spiritual harm, at least when the objectionable feature of the picture is of a sexual nature.[12] Many Catholics would argue: "If it is all right for a priest to see this picture, it is certainly all right for me to do the same."

From what has been said, it would undoubtedly follow that only rarely could any Catholic be justified in attending a B picture. Priests should not hesitate to preach this doctrine. It would certainly help toward lessening the production of pictures "objectionable in part" (oftentimes classified thus because of some lascivious scenes incongruously brought in without any relation to the plot), if Catholics throughout the country protested against such films by the most effective argument that can be brought to the attention of the producers—diminution of the receipts.

Whatever might be said theoretically about attendance at C pictures, in practise a person could be unhesitatingly charged with mortal sin by going to see even one such picture. On the other hand, it could happen that an individual, especially prone to some form of moral weakness, could not safely see some of the pictures listed as unobjectionable for general patronage. But the presumption is against such an occurrence, and scrupulous persons who fear that their virtue is put in grave danger by attendance at pictures which the Legion of Decency classifies as unobjectionable for general patronage should not be encouraged in this attitude by priests to whom they come for guidance.

II.

Are children to be allowed to attend pictures which the Legion of Decency designates as belonging to Section 2 of Class A—pictures regarded as unobjectionable for adults? Sometimes the

---

is the fact that financial support is thus given to the production of this type of movies. However, from this standpoint alone a person could hardly be accused of grave sin, because the material co-operation thus rendered would be remote and trifling.

[12] A priest might attend a private showing of an objectionable picture for the purpose of advising the producer as to the portions that should be eliminated, provided he would not thereby be gravely endangered spiritually.

reason for this classification is the fact that the picture is too heavy for the average child, and devoid of the activity and excitement which children love, but in no wise dangerous to his moral life. A child would do no wrong in attending such a picture, though he would probably fall asleep or walk out. But the majority of these A2 pictures are thus classified because they contain more or less explicit reference to sexual matters, such as conjugal relations, marital infidelity, and pregnancy, or contain a considerable amount of evil in the plot (the presumption being that the evil is shown to be evil). Now, such references, decently presented, would not be harmful to the average adult, but they are likely to stir up undue curiosity in children, and perhaps even lead them to commit sin. Accordingly it would seem that a child would do wrong in attending an A2 picture, unless there is good assurance that in this particular one no danger is present for him because the picture has been thus classified merely on account of its lack of appeal to the average child, or because the child in question is sufficiently mature not to be endangered. As in the previous cases, the presumption is for the prohibition to attend; the lawfulness of attending must be proved.

This brings up another point. Who should be regarded as an adult, who should be considered a child, in applying the rules just stated? Obviously, mere physical age is not the exclusive, nor even the basic, determining factor. One boy or girl of fourteen may be more mature, as regards the matters in question, than another of seventeen or eighteen. The intellectual, moral, and emotional development must be taken into account, as well as the physical. To venture some approximation, I would say that one below the age of sixteen would rarely be regarded as an adult, in the sense that he or she could safely be allowed to see any picture in the A2 class, whereas by the age of eighteen most boys and girls have attained sufficient maturity. Yet, this norm admits of exceptions. There are persons even in their twenties so immature as to be endangered by A2 films—for example, in their presentation of married life and of its responsibilities.

As far as the priest's directions are concerned, it would certainly be permissible for him to tell the pupils of the grade school that they are doing wrong if they attend the A2 pictures. Such a general statement, however, should not be made to the high-school pupils, at least of the two higher grades. Nor should he say as a general rule that attendance by a child at an adult picture is a mortal sin. For, generally speaking, it is not nearly so dangerous for a child to attend an A2 picture as it is for an adult to attend a B picture. Furthermore, the element of scandal is not nearly so pronounced in the former as in the latter case.

A more fundamental question concerns the frequency of movie-attendance which parents may allow their children. From a recent study made by Brother Urban Fleege, S.M., it appears that forty-five per cent of our Catholic high-school boys go to the movies once a week, while thirty per cent go twice a week or oftener.[13] It is of interest to note that this same study reveals that forty-three per cent of the boys questioned admitted that the movies gave them wrong ideas about sex, love and petting.[14] Other studies reveal that substantially this same proportion of movie attendance prevails among children of grade-school age.[15]

Now, apart from its influence on morality, the frequent attendance of an adolescent at the cinema is detrimental to his intellectual and to his physical well-being. Undoubtedly, it makes him less capable of concentrating on his studies; it is likely to render him nervous and excitable; it gives him false notions about the realities of life. It is certainly no help to his physical development to sit in a crowded theater (perhaps in a germ-laden atmosphere) for three or four hours that could be employed in far more healthful recreation if he played a game of ball or took a hike in the country. Accordingly, pastors should tell their parishioners quite explicitly that parents do wrong in allowing their children to go to the movies too often. Those who let their boys and girls attend three or four a week as a regular thing can hardly be free from a grave neglect of their parental responsibility for the mental, physical, and moral welfare of their offspring. I would not hesitate to tell parents that once a week at the movies is the very most they should ordinarily allow their adolescent boys and girls.

Dr. Ruland, in *Foundation of Morality,* makes this statement: "The psychological effect of the photo-play is extremely powerful because through the darkness of the room the attention of the sense organs is almost completely concentrated on the picture. . . .

---

[13] U. Fleege, S.M., *Self-Revelation of the Adolescent Boy* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1945), p. 246.

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 257.

[15] *Ibid.,* p. 247.

The psychological effect of motion pictures, especially upon children, has been studied, and several dangers of serious harm have been pointed out. The worst danger from the moral point of view is the arousing of psychopathic tendencies in both adolescents and adults."[16]

III.

The priest should not content himself with inducing people to avoid harmful movies. He should also endeavor to elevate the moral and cultural standards of the screen, and to promote the increased production of good pictures. For, it must be remembered that the movies can be a source of great good. In the words of Pope Pius XI:

> Good motion pictures are capable of exercising a profoundly moral influence upon those who see them. In addition to affording recreation, they are able to arouse noble ideals of life, to communicate valuable conceptions, to impart better knowledge of the history and beauties of the fatherland and other countries, to present truth and virtue under attractive forms, to create at least the flavor of understanding among nations, social classes and races, to champion the cause of justice, to give new life to the claims of virtue, to contribute positively to the genesis of a just social order in the world.[17]

There is no reason why a priest should not occasionally recommend to his people attendance at good movies, just as he recommends the reading of good books. (I am not now considering the case of the priest who recommends attendance at a movie in the parish hall. The recommendation in that case is based on the social benefit that will accrue to the parishioners and the financial benefit that will come to the church. I am referring to the suggestion that people attend good movies in a public theatre—even a particular picture, mentioned by name—because of the inspirational and cultural value they possess.) It is strange that some good Catholics, including some priests and religious, confine their judgment of a picture solely to the question whether or not it will do harm, and seem not at all concerned whether or not it will do any good. Such an attitude is certainly out of harmony with the ideas of Pope Pius XI, expressed above. Recently a good nun told me that when the *Song of Bernadette* had been presented in the parish hall, she had refrained from attending, believing this to be the better course of action. Her argument was this: "There are many bad movies being presented nowadays; but by attending even a good movie a person gives approval and encouragement to the entire industry, including its bad features; therefore it is better to attend no movies." I could have argued: "There are many bad books being printed nowadays; but by reading even a good book a person gives approval to the entire printing industry, including its bad products; therefore, it is better to abstain from reading any books, even the lives of the saints."

---

[16] Ruland-Rattler, *Foundations of Morality* (St. Louis, 1936), p. 357.

[17] *Vigilanti cura,* AAS, XXVIII (1936), 256; N.C.W.C. translation, p. 9.

The priest can also collaborate toward the producing of good films by urging his people to write letters of approval to a company that produces an exceptionally good picture. Many Catholics are inclined to express their disapproval by letter to the producers when an objectionable film appears, but very few write letters of praise when praise is called for. Now, motion picture producers are much concerned with the attitude of the public toward their productions, and when they receive a large amount of fan-mail, lauding a certain type of picture, they will be inclined to give more of that type.

Those familiar with the motion picture business are inclined to think that a distinctively Catholic company, specializing in films of a Catholic theme, would not be advisable. At most, such a company might be formed for the purpose of making educational and religious films for Catholic schools and parish halls. However, it would be desirable to have more Catholics in the movie business, as administrators, directors, script-writers, etc., so that the Church's ethical teachings may exert a greater influence in the screen-world, to the betterment of conditions as they now exist. Priests might sometimes advise young men to take up this career, provided they feel sure that the prospective candidates are sufficiently trustworthy in their knowledge and practise of the Catholic religion to enter the movie industry safely and to avoid the many pitfalls with which it abounds. In Catholic universities, courses in the phases of the film industry could be established. An occasional talk to the young folks of the parish—for example, at a study-club meeting—on the proper appreciation and evaluation of the movies would surely be helpful.

The Catholic Church contains within itself the power to regulate aright and to sanctify every new phase of human progress. Accordingly, she is fully able to direct mankind in the use of motion pictures in such wise that they will be beneficial to the attainment of eternal life. But in performing this task, the Church needs the united and zealous efforts of her bishops and priests. The Pope has urged us to undertake this task—we must obey.

The main points of this article can be summarized as follows:

(1) Pictures classified as C movies must be avoided by all persons under pain of mortal sin.

(2) An A1 picture can be attended by all persons safely, apart from very exceptional cases.

(3) A person would commit a mortal sin by attending a B picture that constitutes for him a proximate occasion of grave sin, or if by attending he gave grave scandal to others.

(4) Children should not be allowed to attend A2 pictures, or to go to the movies oftener than once a week.

(5) People are bound in conscience to assure themselves of the lawfulness of attending a picture before they go to see it. A person who would habitually and frequently go to see pictures without taking such precautions would ordinarily be guilty of grave sin.

(6) Catholics should be urged to strive to elevate the screen, and priests should direct the faithful in ways of accomplishing this objective.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

ST. JOHN DAMASCENE ON PRAYER

Prayer is the raising of the mind of God or the petitioning of God for that which is fitting. How then did it happen that Our Lord offered prayer in the case of Lazarus and at the time of His passion? For His holy mind did not need to be raised up to God, since once and for all it had been united hypostatically with the Divine Word. Nor was there any need for a petition to God since Christ is God. It was because He appropriated our personality to Himself, and took our impress on Himself, and became an example for us, and taught us to make petition to God and to strive towards Him, and guided us by His own holy mind in the way that leads up to God.

—*De fide orthodoxa,* Lib. III, cap. 24.

THE CULTURAL MISSION OF THE CHURCH

Less than thirty years after the death and resurrection of Our Lord, the apostle St. Paul wrote the first of his two great epistles to the faithful of Corinth. He referred to the dissensions, the result of merely human standards, that existed among them, and he warned them against the spirit of factionalism that had begun to show itself in the Christian community. He reminded them that they did not belong to the world, but that the world was theirs: "For all things are yours, whether it be Paul, or Apollo, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; for all are yours; And you are Christ's; and Christ is God's."[1]

Commenting on these words of the apostle, St. Thomas Aquinas twelve centuries later explained that "the world" included the entire orbit of creation, inasmuch as the created things about us are all aids to the spiritual and temporal welfare of the Christian faithful; and that the "things present" in the Pauline text indicated the goods of this world, which we use to merit the "things to come." All things belong to the Christian, because he belongs to Christ, and Christ belongs to God.[2]

It is precisely because the material serves the spiritual, because the natural serves the supernatural, because all the things of this world are subject in hierarchical order to Almighty God, that the Catholic Church has a cultural mission among the sons of men.

There are almost as many definitions of the word "culture" as there are writers who treat of it, so perhaps all that can be asked of anyone who discusses the subject is that he make clear his own definition at the start. The Latin word, *cultura,* from which our English word "culture" is derived, applies primarily to the cultivation or the tilling of the land, by which the land is enabled through human labor to produce fruits that, left to itself, it would have been incapable of producing. We can arrive at some initial understanding of what culture is and does by picturing to ourselves the contrast between a cultivated, well-tended, productive field, and a tract of land abandoned to the natural growth of weed and bramble.

---

[1] *I Cor.,* 3:22-23.

[2] Cf. *Super primam epistolam S. Pauli Apostoli ad Corinthios,* lectio 3, *in fine.*

When we consider the application of the term "culture" to human beings, there are two main aspects to be remarked. On the one hand, we can look at culture principally from the viewpoint of its effect on the individual. It is in this sense that Jacques Maritain has defined culture as "the expansion of the peculiarly human life, including not only whatever material development may be necessary and sufficient to enable us to lead an upright life on this earth, but also and above all the moral development, the development of the speculative and practical activities (artistic and ethical) peculiarly worthy of being called a human development."[3] On the other hand, we can look upon culture from a primarily corporate, rather than individual, point of view, and consider it as "the whole complex of institutions and customs and beliefs, as well as arts and crafts and economic organization, which make up the social inheritance of a people."[4] (It is in this sense that we speak of a Chinese culture, or "Western culture," or break up the latter term into smaller units and speak, for instance, of "French culture," or "Spanish culture.")

These two viewpoints from which culture may be considered are by no means perfectly distinct or mutually exclusive. They are interdependent. It is true that "non-human" elements (geographical location and climatic conditions, for example) play a considerable part in the origin and development of a people's "social inheritance." But it is also true that culture is formed and maintained principally by the creative intellect of man. "Western culture" may be considered as the particular religious, moral, political, and social environment in which a certain group of individuals lives; but its particular customs and institutions have in themselves been created or adopted by previous generations of human individuals. Culture is not a static thing. Men of a particular culture are part of the constantly self-renewing human stream that creates and modifies this culture; and they themselves are acted upon by it and formed according to its norms.

---

[3] "Religion and Culture," in *Essays in Order,* by Christopher Dawson, Jacques Maritain, and Peter Wust (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1940), p. 8.

[4] Christopher Dawson, *The Judgment of the Nations* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1942), p. 93. A survey of various notions of culture, and a comparison between the uses of the terms, "civilization," and "culture," may be found in Andrew J. Krzesinski's *Is Modern Culture Doomed?* (New York: The Devin-Adair Co., 1942), pp. 1-11.

When we consider the mission of the Church with regard to culture, we include both aspects of the word. According to the synthesis just outlined, the culture of a people is taken to include both peculiarly human individual development and the total environment in which that people lives. But ultimately the cultural mission of any institution must aim mainly (though not entirely) at the cultural formation of individuals, since it is the action of individual human beings that plays the dominant part in the creation and modification of a cultural environment.

We must not forget that culture is of itself a temporal thing. It is of the earth; it uses earthly means; and it tends, of itself, to an earthly perfection. Men, however, do not exist for the sake of a culture. Culture exists for the sake of men. A man is a creature endowed with an immortal soul. He has not here on earth a lasting city. His supreme good is not the enjoyment of earthly happiness, but the Beatific Vision—the joy of God's presence for all eternity. Man's life on earth, all worldly goods, and all human culture must be directed towards that end. What is to assure man that culture be truly his servant, and not his master? Where is culture to find its norm, its safeguard, and its guide? The answers to these questions are found in the answer to another: what is the role of the Catholic Church with respect to culture?

In order to determine the nature and scope of the Church's cultural mission, we must consider what the Church is. For, according to the scholastic axiom, *operatio sequitur esse;* and from what the Church is, we may reason to what her activity must be. There are three aspects of the Church's being which seem of special importance in connection with her cultural function. The Catholic Church is, first, the representative of the divine on earth; second, she is, and must be (it follows from the first aspect), the great defender of truly human rights; and third, the Catholic Church is an actually and historically existing universal, supranational, and supra-political organization.

From the fact that the Church is the representative of the divine on earth, the one, true Church established by Jesus Christ for the salvation of mankind, it follows that her essential aim is to save the souls of men. But from this great goal there proceeds what might be called a cultural corollary: the Church must watch over human development and human institutions that they may serve, and not oppose, this all-important purpose. The men with whom the Church works, whom she enrolls in the Kingdom of God on earth, are not abstract ideas of human nature; they are living, breathing, working, playing, waking and sleeping individual men. Since it is his culture that so largely forms a man, culture must be informed by the Catholic Church. To restore all things in Christ is her object, and there is no other way in which she can attain it.

The Catholic Church, because she represents the divine order on earth, is also the defender of truly human rights. She is the defender of the positive human values against what one writer has called "the eternal negative of evil." She recognizes what man really is—not an anatomical machine, a well-developed beast, but a creature made in the image and likeness of God, gifted with intelligence and free will and an immortal soul. This is why the Church insists, for instance, that the institutions and laws of a state should be a reflection and application of the natural moral law, a law impressed and imprinted on the soul of man because of what man is—a law that is human in the only true sense, because it recognizes and proclaims its dependence on the super-human, the divine. It is why she insists also on the sanctity of the family and of family life. And the family is in itself a subordinate cultural unit, which cannot be eliminated without destroying the Christian cultural whole. In substance, then, the humanism of the Catholic Church is a true humanism, not a vicious parody. Her humanism is the humanism of the Incarnation, purified by the precious blood shed on Calvary by a Man who was also God.

The Church is, third, a great, universal institution, transcending nations and politics; an institution which knows no geographical limitations and is confined by no political frontiers. And she is the only religious institution of her kind. It is possible to be even more explicit. The Catholic Church is not *a* church; she is *the* Church. Catholicism is not *a* religion; it is *the* Religion.

Now human cultures are not of themselves universalizing forces; they are narrowing, particularizing forces. And the only institution in the world today which of its very nature cannot be assimilated by a particular culture, nation, or even political state, and made its tool, its lackey, the creature of its will, is the Catholic Church.

The function of culture has often been abused in human history, so that the representatives of one subordinate cultural group have thrown themselves in fury upon another, in the name of national ambition or of some theory of a master race. But the Catholic Church, truly catholic in the sense of universal, is a living universalizing force, transcending all cultures, transcending all forms of civilization, standing as the symbol of the brotherhood of all men, under the eternal Fatherhood of God. This Church is not an abstract idea. It exists, actually and historically. It is a symbol, a sign—like a sacrament; but like a sacrament also, it can effect what it signifies. The Catholic Church holds out to all men a possibility of brotherhood; and it is in itself that brotherhood in fact.

The cultural mission of the Church imposes grave cultural responsibilities upon the individual Catholics who make up her membership. As children of the Mother Church, all Catholics have the duty of furthering, as far as lies in their power, her cultural mission among men.

The first responsibility in this regard is so obvious that it scarcely needs mention. It is the duty of personal sanctification. As far as the reaction of her children upon human culture is concerned, the Church does not depend primarily upon organization. She depends upon the influence on their environment of convinced Catholics, leading Catholic lives, and mirroring as best they can, under God's grace, the justice, the sanctity, the love, the patience, the humility, and the courage of Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. As John Henry Newman reminded us, the very person of the true Christian, his mere presence among men, is an argument for Christ.[5]

The cultural responsibility of the individual Catholic falls in a special manner upon the Catholic educator. The Church is the holder of the divine commission to speak to men the things that are of God. As the Catholic Church stands alone as the representative of the divine on earth, as the representative of a spiritual order transcending the material, so the Catholic educator stands alone among the doctors of a secularized world in the true value he places on the things of God. The Catholic school, from primary grades to university, stands as a twin pillar of Catholic culture with the Catholic home. The Catholic may teach what is regarded as a purely secular subject, but he can never be a purely secular teacher.

---

[5] Cf. *Sermons on Subjects of the Day* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891), pp. 133 f.

This is not to say, of course, that the Catholic curriculum must become just so many courses in religion under a variety of subject titles. Human culture, and the various fields of knowledge and appreciation that enter into the preparation of a cultured man, have their own rights. Unless the graduates of Catholic schools are adequately prepared for entrance into the various fields of cultural activity, they can hardly inform those fields with Catholic ideals. But the Catholic teacher must never lose sight of the true subordination of values. The world does not forgive or forget our Catholicism. If a Catholic in public life is dishonest, for instance, how is he known and alluded to in the newspapers and magazines? Simply as a dishonest politician? Certainly not. He is referred to as dishonest—*and a Catholic.* It is important, most important, for Catholic educators to train good lawyers, skilled doctors and nurses, capable literary men, competent engineers. But if Catholic teachers do not at the same time instill into their students the true concept of divine Revelation, a respect for right and truth, and a love of sound moral principles, then they have failed, and failed miserably, and they have despoiled Catholic education both of its meaning and its reason for existence.

The Catholic Church is, as we have seen, the defender of human rights, and the members of that Church have consequent cultural responsibilities. It is the testimony of history that the Church has always stood, and often stood alone, for the dignity and worth of the individual man. Catholics march perforce from Jerusalem to Jericho along the winding roads of the world, but they dare not leave a single wounded human being untended by the way. In the field of education, the Catholic teacher must not forget that it is the whole human being with whom he is concerned. He cannot concentrate upon the intellectual virtues and leave the moral virtues to take care of themselves as best they may. A secular teacher may do this, and pride himself on doing it. The Catholic teacher has a higher mission, and he must be faithful to it.

Finally, the individual Catholic is a child of our Holy Mother the Church as she exists as an organized body, in the world today. Now the Catholic Church, precisely as an organized body, is the most bitterly attacked institution on the face of the earth. This is not surprising. Why should the disciples escape the hatred of the forces of evil, when the Master Himself did not? If the Catholic Church is to fulfill her cultural mission, her children must stand loyally by her side. They must be loyal to the Church *as she exists;* not loyal merely to some vague set of "Christian principles," which may be (and often are) so watered down that there is hardly any principle remaining, and almost nothing Christian. Loyalty to the Church means loyalty to her as she exists in the world, presided over by the Vicar of Christ and ruled under him by the bishops of the dioceses spread across the world. It means loyalty to the directives of the Church; a loyalty which does not allow the papal encyclicals to rest dead letters, or letters endowed only with the dubious life granted to them by lip-service. Catholics are members of a Church which (it can bear repeating) is not an abstraction but an historical reality—the "land flowing with milk and honey," the City of Light.

The task of the Church is not an easy one; and neither is the co-operation in it of the individual Catholic. The spirit of totalitarianism is not dead: one form of it, and one form only, lies buried in the ruins of the Reich. The Church faces the task of re-winning for Christ a Western culture which has denied its heritage, which has become a culture no longer Christian but secular. The Church still stands and calls to those who have wandered from her side. To serve under her banner is a proud privilege—it is to march on the high Crusade. Catholics may fail at times, and Catholics may seem to fail, but Christ is with his Church until the end. The world does not belong to greed and hatred, to lust and rapine and murder. The world belongs to those who are Christ's. Because the Catholic belongs to Christ, he stands in testimony to Him amidst the civilizations of the world. He stands with Christ among the doctors; he stands with Paul upon the Hill of Mars; he stands with Francis of Assisi in the market-place;—and he stands on Tower Hill with Thomas More.

EDMOND DARVIL BENARD

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

MISSION INTENTION

"That false Nationalism may not hinder the spread of Christianity" is the Mission Intention for the month of April, 1946.

THE LIVING WORD

As a social being, man must communicate his ideas to his fellowmen; hence the Creator endowed him with the divine gift of speech. For in the whole range of signs and symbols which the material order of things offers the intellect for its use, nothing can compare with the spoken word. That gift is aptly called divine, because it distinguishes man from the beast, and makes him resemble God. From all eternity God conceived and expressed the Word, which is His Son, thus as it were speaking to Himself. When that Word clothed Himself with our human nature, He became by His beauteous presence and wonderful deeds, but more than all by the divine doctrine which fell from His lips, a voice by which God spoke to us, His creatures. Man, therefore, not only in conceiving, but in orally expressing the word, is the image of his Creator. His spoken word is not himself over again, as the Word is in God, yet for all practical purposes, we take it as standing for himself. It reflects his mind and his will, his very nature and individual traits. It is his ambassador, bearing his authority and his responsibility, and is the object of the same criticism or praise as he himself.

But above all, the word is an expression of a man's life, for unless it actually proceeds from a living man it is no word at all; and what is more, it is in pronouncing it, in the exercise of speech, that he reaches his highest pitch of animation. The mind, first, is never more active than when the mouth is uttering its judgments; and, then, not only the mouth shares in the utterance, but the eye, the face, the head, the entire body as well; for the oral word, perfect as it is, is not an adequate sign of the thought,

"For words, like nature, half reveal
And half conceal the soul within,"

but the mind, chafing under the hindrance to its expression, calls to the aid of the organs of speech the whole sensitive nature of man.

Speech is such a noble, and at the same time necessary, ornament to man's nature, that many suppose that at his first creation in the person of Adam, he received directly from God, not only the faculty of speech itself, but its actual and perfect use through the instrument of a divinely formed language.

Would that we could have seen and heard Adam when he answered God and expressed his satisfaction with Eve; or when he used his knowledge at God's bidding and gave names to the animals; or still again when, in cringing fear, he excused himself and blamed Eve for his sin, and she spoke too, putting the blame on the serpent. The scriptural record of what they said little satisfies us; it but fires us with the desire for the living words as they fell from our first parents' lips in the place and at the time they uttered them.

This is most significant about speech, that we cannot be satisfied with its written symbol. We recognize it to be a living thing, to be such a part of the person who uses it, that we crave the sight of that person actually delivering himself of his thought, before we feel that his speech means to us all that it should. This is especially the case when the dead record that may have reached us opens up to us a gifted or eminent mind, a person who is great in some way which attracts us. A Spaniard is said to have travelled to Italy simply to see Livy. When Athens was in its glory as the home of learning, the mere wish to see the "breathing, moving Plato" attracted youths from all parts of the then known world. One of the greatest wishes of St. Augustine was to have heard St. Paul preach; the fame of St. Ambrose induced him to undertake the difficult journey from Carthage to Milan which resulted in his conversion. And what is true of ancient times is no less true now, when there are so many mechanical contrivances to supplement or reproduce the living voice.

The privilege of hearing the speaker is not only desirable, but even necessary when it is a question of a teacher whose doctrine concerns us. As Newman wrote in his *Historical Sketches:*

> The type is a poor substitute for the human voice. It has no means of arousing, moderating, and adjusting the attention; it has no emphasis except italics, and this meagre notation cannot finely graduate itself to the need of the occasion. It cannot in this way mark the heed which should be specially and chiefly given to peculiar passages and words. It has no variety of manner and intonation, to show by their changes how the words are to be accepted, or what comparative importance is to be attached to them. It has no natural music to take the ear, like the human voice; it carries with it no human eye to range, and to rivet the student when on the verge of truancy, and to command his intellectual activity by an appeal to the courtesies of life. Half the symbolism of a living language is thus lost when it is committed to paper; and that symbolism is the very means by which the forces of the hearer's mind can be best economized or most pleasantly excited. The lecture, on the other hand, as delivered,

> possesses all these instruments to win and hold, and harmonize the attention; and above all, it imparts to the whole teaching a human character which the printed book can never supply.

These are the words of a college professor of the nineteenth century. Let us go back to the distant days of Plato. In the *Phaedrus* he discourses thus on the superiority of the spoken word over the written:

> Those who strive to learn wisdom from letters get, not the reality, but its appearance. Writing only serves as a reminder of what has been otherwise thought, namely, by oral instruction. Writing shares the disadvantage of painting. The productions of painting stand there as if they were alive, but if you ask them a question, preserve a solemn and dignified silence. Just so it is with writing. It is read by all whether it concerns them or not, and is unable to speak or be silent with the proper persons. If it is misinterpreted or maligned, it can neither explain nor defend itself. So much so that he who thinks to leave an art in writing, and he also who receives it as being, when written, something clear and certain, must be very simple.

Now in the whole range of great personalities and teachers, who is there that we should more desire to see and hear than Christ, the Redeemer of our race? How we envy the Apostles and His other contemporaries who could follow Him as He journeyed in Galilee and Judea and Samaria, and hear Him actually preach. With the fascinating glow of His countenance, the movement of His mouth and eyes, His manifold gestures, the waving of His robes and His hair, how wonderful must His words have seemed, how unmistakable their import! The Jews who heard him explain the Eucharist understood Him as He intended, namely, literally; Protestants who attribute so much power to the written word cannot convince themselves that He meant any such thing as the literal eating of His Body. This is true of the other sacraments, even of the most clear words concerning the foundation of the Church and the headship of St. Peter.

And yet we have less reason to regret our misfortune in not having lived at the time of Christ, than we have in the case of Plato or Aristotle, St. Augustine, or St. Thomas; or any other merely human teacher. We have no longer the sight of His person, nor the sound of His voice; but we have their equivalent. We have a means of ascertaining the import of His words as effectually as if we heard Him speaking in person. We have His Church, which carries on by oral tradition the revelation received through Him, and which has been only partially expressed in writing. She is a living voice using a language we understand, and speaking to us in circumstances that make her thoughts unmistakable.

Apart from such an institution, even the inspired writings of the Bible would be no certain guide for us in determining the nature of the truths of Revelation. There is no better proof of this than the multiplicity of meanings which Protestants find in each single text—meanings which divide them among themselves almost as much as they divide them from us; nothing better proves the wisdom of our Redeemer, who is God, in establishing a living Teacher to speak in His stead, when He could no longer remain with us.

It is only in her mouth, either in the person of her Supreme Pontiff telling us from his throne what has been revealed, or in her priest admonishing us from the pulpit, that it can properly be said: "the word of God is living and effectual, and more piercing than any two-edged sword; and reaching into the division of the soul and the spirit, of the joints also and the marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (*Heb.* 4:12).

There is only one case where Christ Himself wrote, namely, when they brought Him the woman taken in adultery. Not deigning to say what He thought of her accusers, He bent down and wrote something in the sand. He wrote *in the sand,* that is in something in which the characters would not be permanent, but must perish. With this solitary exception, the God-Man never wrote. Nor did He command His disciples to write, but rather to *teach and preach.* And when they did write, even with divine inspiration, they did not all write, nor did they pretend to record all that was said and done by Christ. Nor again, is what they wrote possessed of any real authority of its own, so that whoever reads may understand it as he chooses; but its meaning must be interpreted as confirmed by the living voice of the Church, of whose authority these same writings give clear and unmistakable testimony.

Such is a brief survey of the history of the living word, which always has been the most perfect vehicle of thought between man and man, and which was selected by God as the only trustworthy instrument of His Revelation. Of this great and beautiful truth we are sweetly reminded by the feast of Christmas. The Word of God becomes flesh and dwells amongst us. He who is the Splendor of the Father and the Figure of His Substance; to see whom is to see the Father, and to hear whom is to hear Him who sent Him, appears as a silent infant in the arms of His mother. When He grew to a scholar's estate it is not said that He studied the Scriptures by Himself, but that He once tarried in the Temple and was found sitting amidst the doctors of the Jewish church, "hearing them and asking them questions." When He at last revealed Himself as the Son of God and as His Legate, assuming the office of a teacher, He spoke as no man had ever yet spoken. Many prophets and kings had desired to see and hear Him. We, like Abraham, have seen His day, and still hear Him through His Church. Let us with Abraham rejoice!

WALTER GREENE

Trenton, N. J.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the April, 1896, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, the leading article, by the Rev. L. W. Reilly, is entitled "The Education of Catholic Deaf-Mutes in the United States." The author estimates that the number of Catholic deaf-mutes in our country is between eight thousand and ten thousand. He complains that very little is being done for the religious training of the juvenile members of this group, and asserts that "a majority of the thousands of Catholic children who have been educated in the State institutions during the past eighty years have lost the faith, and the thousand and odd now in our 'non-sectarian' public institutions are in almost certain danger of being lost to the Church." (A happy contrast to this sad condition of a half-century ago is the zealous apostolate that is being exercised for deaf-mutes in our land today by scores of devoted priests). . . . Bishop Maes, of Covington, writing on "Preparatory Seminaries," expresses the view that in the case of younger boys aspiring to the priesthood too much seclusion from the world should be avoided, so that the solidity of their virtue may be better tested. . . . Fr. Heuser, writing on the jurisdiction of Latin bishops over Catholics of the Oriental rites in the United States, explains the prescriptions of the Holy See referring to the administration of the sacraments by Latin priests to members of the Oriental rites. (It is interesting to note that the permission to receive Holy Communion in another rite, so freely granted now by the Code, Canon 866, was then permitted only in those places where there was not a priest or a church of one's own rite). . . . The answer to one of the questions submitted by a correspondent reminds us that in those days it was customary for Catholics who had contracted marriage before a minister or a civil magistrate to make a public acknowledgment of their fault.

F. J. C.

THE TEACHING OF THEOLOGY TO THE LAITY

Frankly this is a personal article. It is personal in the sense that it represents my own experience and is an effort to convey that experience. While it is true that much of the material might have been presented in an impersonal way, I do not feel that it would have served the purpose that I have in mind. For it is in no sense another article on the question of "Theology for the Laity" in the abstract. Neither is it an effort to state the case for such a course or to demonstrate its necessity. Less still is it to be conceived of as a controversial piece. Elements of all these things may be found in the article but these pages are primarily an effort to touch upon a phase of theology for lay people that is still pretty much *terra incognita,* namely, "What happens when you teach it?"

Up to the summer of 1945 I had read a great deal *pro* and *con* on the subject of theology for the laity, had talked about it, thought about it, and above all wondered how to do it. Then last summer, faced with the actual teaching of it, I did it. What follows is the product of that experience. It is an effort to describe the state of mind of one who might be termed a "professional theologian" while he is engaged in the teaching of theology to the laity. It is also an effort to give an objective statement of the results of that experience. The purpose of the whole thing is to make a contribution to the subject from the point of view of field work or better the laboratory table of a classroom.

To give the experience its proper setting certain facts must be set down. This course in Theology for the Laity was taught at the Catholic University Summer School from July 1 to Aug. 13, 1945. There were two set courses given: Fundamental Theology taught by the Rev. Joseph C. Fenton, S.T.D.; Dogmatic Theology taught by myself, with each course being allotted sixty hours. The class in dogmatic theology had sixty students and included fifty-two sisters, one teaching brother, and seven lay students. In view of these facts two limitations must be noted. First, it was a question of teaching theology to religious for the most part and this factor controlled a good deal of the method and strongly colored the presentation throughout. Secondly, the experience described here was limited to a single six-weeks summer session and was the writer's first such effort. Thus what conclusions are given must be regarded as tentative and subject to revision as more experience is gained and the teaching of additional tracts permits of a clearer perspective on the matter as a whole.

With these points as a background the material here is handled under five general headings:

(I) Material.
(II) Method.
(III) Application of the material to the lives of the students.
(IV) Results.
(V) General observations on the future of such a course.

I. Material

The matter for this session was the Incarnation and the Redemption. The original reasons for beginning in this order rather than following the formal theological order were two. First, to facilitate the entrance of these students in theology by opening with something with which they were at least generally familiar. A familiarity which would arise from their spiritual, devotional, and scriptural reading, deepened, in turn, by meditation (*e.g.,* The Passion, Nativity, and Resurrection). Secondly, the very abundance of scripture texts occurring in these tracts would give to these students a recognizable and fairly familiar footing in the study of them. This would serve to keep them from feeling that they were lost in a strange and unexplored land, since in these scripture texts they would be seeing well-known landmarks. The choice of these tracts was, therefore, an emphasis on the order of learning rather than on the order of subject matter itself. This reasoning and choice were, it seems to me, clearly vindicated in the actual teaching. Moreover, during the teaching several other points presented themselves which not only substantiated that original premise but clarified it.

First of all, both of these tracts give a balanced and integrated picture of both speculative and positive theology and their interrelationships. The imposing councils of the early centuries, the errors that brought them about, the creeds that resulted are all a graphic portrayal of the *magisterium* of the Church at work. The scriptural texts employed let the students see how this source of Revelation is set in the service of the Church teaching, being controlled by its infallible *magisterium.* The whole strongly emphasizes, in a concrete way, the fundamental nature and importance of Revelation. In the matter of speculative theology these tracts give a vivid delineation of intelligence in vital contact with revealed truth, organizing, analysing, synthesizing. This is particularly apt here since the speculative theology is centering about a subject that is constantly entering into their worship, prayer, spiritual reading, and spiritual life. Evidencing, as it does, the need for accuracy, the value of logical and analytical organization, speculative theology considerably clarifies thinking on this point. Further it demonstrates the riches contained in the revelation of the Incarnation and deducible from it, while, at the same time, showing its rational justification. Perhaps the best way of summing up the value of speculative theology in these tracts is to say that it made clear to them that they need not be fearful of using their intelligence in pondering on these mysteries, for they can see clearly how much intelligence can draw from them when illuminated and guided by faith.

Also apparent during the teaching of these tracts was the fact that so evident is their internal unity that they brought out strikingly the cogent organization of scientific theology. Thus once the structure of these tracts is laid bare they get a picture of the whole that is not too difficult to retain. This is perhaps best illustrated by taking a single section, the humanity of Christ, and showing the framework:

I. Human Nature of Christ *(totus et integer)*
    A. Soul
        1. Intellect
            a. Knowledge
                1. *beata*
                2. infused
                3. acquired
            b. Error
                1. infallibility
        2. Will
            a. Liberty
            b. Sin
    B. Body

This scheme gives a good idea of this point and as will be seen under another heading illustrates a great deal of the personal spiritual significance of the Incarnation.

II. Method

Obviously the question of method is, by and large, the key to success or failure in this course. Frankly I admit that I have still much to learn in this regard. What is set down here represents, for the most part, actual notes jotted down at the end of each week by way of improving what I had done up to that point. It must be admitted, too, that some of that experience was very salutary. Nothing so exposes the weakness of a teacher's method as the distressing experience of explaining something for twenty minutes or more and then realizing that he has not struck a single responsive chord in his class. This happened often enough in the first couple of weeks to force a great deal of thought and experimentation. The results of this experimentation thus far would indicate that while retaining the theological method intact, the real issue is one of emphasis and approach. The results themselves are treated here under eight tentative conclusions.

(1) *The insistence on the theological character of the material as distinguished from apologetics.*

Such an insistence drives home the fact that theology begins with Revelation, and that it is Revelation as it is proposed by the Church which is the guide. Reason is used, but it is reason as it is guided and illumined by faith. It is only by way of such constant insistence that the full significance of a thesis together with the cogency of its theological proof began to appear.

(2) *A careful and detailed explanation of each thesis in the light of the theological note that is attached to it. (These notes are:de fide definita; de fide ex ordinario et universali magisterio; certa; communis; probabilior; probabilis.)*

It was by means of this emphasis on the theological notes that the full signicance of the *magisterium* of the Church was brought out. By doing this, concrete form was given to what was begun by the first step noted above. I found here that it was wise and valuable to insist on this with every thesis because only gradually were the relations between revelation, the *magisterium,* and speculative theology made clear in the students' minds. Lastly this was the best means of bringing out the positive value of the thesis method for learning the matter.

(3) *The simple citation of the literal meaning of a scripture text was ordinarily of no value for the student.*

The reasons for this conclusion are somewhat hard to isolate. It would appear that many of the texts had been so tied up with accomodated spiritual meanings that they had lost their literal force for many. Some texts conveyed very little to them because they had never thought of them being analyzed and compared with other texts to bring out a dogmatic content. Very often, too, in the case of texts drawn from St. Paul, they had no dogmatic cogency until they were shown not only in their immediate context but until their part in St. Paul's whole argument and exhortation was demonstrated. Also involved was the task of showing how the ideas technically expressed in the thesis were the ideas contained in the scripture texts. This difficulty seemed, at times, to arise from a state of mind which judged that since the words were different then the fundamental realities which they expressed must be different also.

(4) *The major errors about a doctrine are to be treated only insofar as they clarify the point at issue.*

The character of this approach is the avoidance of a purely polemical aspect in treating the errors. Basically, of course, the polemical aspect must remain and the fallacy of the error be exposed. But the emphasis was on the use of these errors to bring into bold relief the point at issue with which the thesis itself was concerned. The erroneous and heretical answers were analyzed to clear away the brushwood from the pure position and enable the teacher to emphasize both the cogency and exactitude of the Catholic position and answer. In treating these errors it proved very helpful and illuminating to point out the fundamental principles and attitudes toward life, man, nature, religion, etc., that gave rise to the specific errors. And this in turn opened the way to presenting the Catholic attitude as embodied in the particular thesis.

(5) *The philosophical element presents a difficulty but not an insuperable one.*

Personally, this question of philosophy represented a major misgiving in planning the actual teaching of the course. It seemed obvious that any real treatment of theology called for some knowledge of fundamental metaphysical principles and terms. But how much could be presupposed? How much could be supplied? How keep this from throwing the whole course out of balance? Once again it was a matter for experiment. Time was lost and mistakes were made. At the end of the course my conclusions were these: the students were capable of grasping the fundamental metaphysical principles needed; the major difficulty was one of terminology, *e.g.*, person, nature, act, potency, substance, accident, essence, existence, and so on. The method employed to convey these ideas was to set aside some classes and use them to set up the metaphysical framework itself stressing relationships of part to part and of part to the whole framework. Then each time a principle or term occurred in an actual part of the tract it was shown in this framework and its actual application carefully analyzed. It was a question of patience, repetition, and encouragement. It should be remarked though, that I am far from claiming a solution to this problem. All I say here is that I think that I solved it sufficiently to teach these tracts and that on the basis of this I think that it can be done.

(6) *In matters of theological opinion a single school of thought should be given the stress.*

What this conclusion emphasized is that a careful distinction must be made between theological certainties and those things that are debated among the schools. For the sake of the teaching I only occasionally delineated the position of those schools that differed from the common Thomistic teaching on the point. The reason for this was to avoid causing confusion of the main issues while at the same time keeping the students' minds from being overburdened with a mass of detail. That there were other opinions was clearly noted and if they contributed to a better understanding of the matter or the point at issue they were given. But the bulk of the effort was to leave them with a consistent and harmonious view on the debated points and material.

(7) *Constant and detailed attention to the relationships in the tract itself.*

With every thesis stress was laid on its relation with the previous thesis, the whole section, and finally with the whole matter treated up to that point. Then its relation with the steps to come was indicated. These relationships were not only the logical ones but what I might term the intrinsic ones. All this helped in clearing up difficulties and in presenting a balanced view of the tract. The full result might be described as the presentation of a picture of a well-articulated whole.

(8) *Ample opportunity for questions.*

During the teaching of the course the questions asked by the students not only helped them but offered a great deal of illumination to the teacher on what to stress and also where he was slipping up or was not clear. Questions were invited and the students were allowed to ask them at any point in the class; wherever they had a difficulty, or failed to understand a term or follow the argument. By learning to treat every question carefully and fully, a basic confidence was built up that added greatly to the interest and attention of the class. Along this line I learned that as I finished a section or even a thesis it was well to set the next day as a question period and to encourage the students to go over their notes and write down all their difficulties or note any point upon which they were not clear. Some of these question periods lasted an hour and a half. Eventually through experience with both the limitations and needs of the class I was able to turn these periods into a most effective form of review in which both the students and the teacher fully participated.

Summary: The method described here is essentially the theological method with emphasis on the reasons for it. However, as it is clear, there are enlargements, additions, and particularizations in view of the class itself.

III. APPLICATION OF THE MATERIAL TO THE LIVES OF THE STUDENTS

It seems to be primarily this question of the relation of theology to the life of the student that has given rise to most of the discussion concerning the value and need of theology for this particular type of student. What follows, however, is in no sense a formal answer but only a description of the points that were insisted upon during this course without any claim to have answered or settled the discussion. At the most it concerns itself only with the principles that guided the application of this matter and indicates some of the actual applications made.

First of all application as used here is not to be confused with the purely practical, *i.e.,* the doing of something. It was my conviction in teaching the course as it is my conviction now that a subject which is primarily speculative cannot make its proper contribution if its presentation is determined by primarily practical aims. For while recognizing in this particular course the need for emphasis on the order of learning, the essentially intellectual character of theology must not be lost sight of. Whatever be the social and spiritual needs of the individual, they must not be allowed to dominate the teaching of a theological course—even for the laity. If concentration on moral activity and the fulfillment of the spiritual needs submerges the intellectual formation of the recipient then theology does not and cannot make its proper contribution which is in the intellectual order.

This insistence on the intellectual character of theology and its primarily speculative function is of paramount importance to the whole course. Yet such insistence and such a function do not mean that there is no relation between speculative theology and life. It is true that being intellectually formed by theology and living a Christ-like life are not one and the same thing. But it does not follow that speculative theology has no positive or vital relation to living a Christ-like life; neither is it to be assumed that because of its intellectual character theology has no real contribution to make to moral activity. Intelligence, of course, is not the only factor in life but it is the essential factor, whose importance and place may not be ignored. Neither then is it to be ignored or set aside in the formation of a full Catholic life, on the graduate or professional level. And when we deal with the place of intelligence in a fully formed Catholic life then (as the whole history of Catholic life indicates) we must deal with it in terms of speculative theology —a speculative theology which is itself the product of a vital union between Divine Truth and the reflective human intelligence.

It was in view of this approach just described that the course was taught and specific applications made. Only a couple of these applications are noted here since all that is intended is a cross-section of this effort, with particular emphasis on the principles and point of view that gave rise to these applications.

The immediate aim was to make clear where and to what extent intelligence plays a part in matters of faith. It was not a question of sheer rationalism but of bringing out how intelligence is guided and illuminated by faith. At the same time there was a constant effort to make evident the importance of accuracy and exactitude of thought. This gave to the class an appreciation of the importance of the work of the theologian and some idea of his contribution to the life of the Church throughout her history. Again and again occasion was taken to show how easy it is to go astray in the matter of such things as definitions.

By way of clarifying this matter of precision of definition and term it might be well to state here, at least in brief, the way in which this was brought out. Clear and precise definitions are the skeletal bones of all sound thought and in no place is this so necessary and of such vital consequence as in the explanation of revealed truth. Precision of ideas in matters of religion is no sterile contribution to its vital living. Such precision lies behind the distinction between various operations of the mind and the classification of its ideas according to real things. All these are the contribution of the speculative scholastics. Nor is accuracy and precision of thought something alien to the living of a full spiritual life in the world by an educated Catholic. For the spiritual life is a complexus of realities which when brought into contact with the world gives rise to intricate problems, relationships, and dangerous possibilities that call for a sound speculative theology as a guide. One need only go back to the Jansenism or Quietism to see the necessity of a sound speculative theology with its careful definitions, distinctions and precision of thought on the natural and supernatural.

To illustrate all of this, two examples of what was done in class will suffice here. Thus in dealing with the human nature of Christ the question of His human will was taken up together with its corollary questions of liberty and sinlessness. Just to make this point clear: there is need for an exact notion of sin, an exact notion of liberty and its species, and a knowledge of the fundamental relation between knowing and willing. Out of this very analysis springs up any number of clear ideas concerning the elements that enter into the living of a Christian life: the relation by nature of man to his final end; the use of liberty in the attainment of this end; the relation between the power of sinning and the gift of liberty and how in actual reality sin is truly an enslavement of liberty, and consequently the need for asceticism to achieve freedom from the servitude that sin imposes.

Something similar was shown in treating a matter like the superabundance of the Redemption. The superabundant character of Christ's satisfactory work was delineated in detail so that a clear and accurate perception of its theological and dogmatic realities would be evident. At the same time it was shown how by seeing in detail the full theological picture of this work one had an accurate intellectual picture of the visible, forcible, and effective manifestation of God's love for man. Using this intelligent basis for conviction could be a bedrock incentive for loving God. We are called to love God because He has first of all loved us. And it is shown clearly and accurately just what His love entailed, a manifestation that results in the student no longer depending on a pious adherence but on established realities with all their consequences.

As a final point under this heading it should be remembered that the great majority of this class were either teachers of religion or religious teachers. They had been faced again and again with the questions and problems brought to them by their students. Accordingly specific applications were made in view of this. The idea was not to present them with ready-made answers but it was an effort to teach them how to answer these problems by the use of principles and the employment of the theological framework itself. The principles derived from their study showed them where error lies, and what is the road of truth. The very things that were theologically worked out for them could indicate both the approach to the problem and the positive realities that it looked to. This same framework could be brought into consideration in giving their answers in a Christian context. Viewed simply as a matter of intellectual formation this method could prove to be of lasting value for them.

In concluding it must be noted that this treatment has been for the most part quite general. But to make it anything else would have required the transcription of a day-by-day journal. Hence I have been content to give as far as possible an objective picture of the attitude and point of view with which I taught and which in turn indicated and gave form to specific applications as the occasion arose.

IV. RESULTS

Under this heading is given the examination and a survey of the marks as some indication of the concrete and observable results of the course. The examination consisted of the following questions:

(1) Define: person, nature, substance, subsistence, existence.
(2) Explain in detail: In Christ the divine nature and the human nature are hypostatically united in the one Person of the Word.
(3) Prove: Christ truly and properly redeemed us by His Passion and death undertaken out of obedience and love.
(4) Explain the Catholic doctrine concerning Christ's satisfactory death.
(5) Organize the elements in the divine plan of salvation.

In the actual examination there were seven papers turned in that were exceptional for accuracy, a clear grasp of the point at issue, clarity, and understanding of the subject as a whole. The rest varied from good to competent with a few (six to be exact) that gave only the bare essentials. The whole set of examinations with one exception indicated a grasp of the tracts as a whole that was far above anything that I had expected from a first effort such as this. As a general conclusion based on the examinations I would say that while a number of things can be improved in the light of this experience still there is a real potentiality there that requires only effort and understanding upon the part of the teacher plus a willingness to profit from the day-to-day teaching.

V. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE FUTURE OF SUCH A COURSE

One of the first needs that suggests itself for the future of a course such as this is a text-book. However, a text-book for this class should not be hastily compiled. It should definitely wait upon the future. Until all the tracts have been taught and there is a common fund of experience to draw upon, any text-book lays itself open to great difficulty. It would seem to me that it is a much more practical and economical procedure to use presently available text-books in theology rather than rush into print a half-baked affair that is purely *a priori*.

While it is true that there is a theological text-book in English (Pohle-Preuss) it seems to me from experience both as teacher and student it is the least satisfactory one. It is diffuse in its general treatments, and very diffuse in technical details and the plethora of schools and divisions that are brought in. The thesis statements are or at least can be very misleading as well as the theological notes that are attached. In view of these things it would appear a better idea to make an English translation of some more standard book such as Tanquerey or Hervé. These have a very compact schematic integrity and a better placed emphasis on the essential and important matters, and because they are synopses they are much more easily adapted to teaching.

One final point will close this report, and that looks to the teacher. Judging only from this experience I should say that the teaching of a course such as this is of inestimable value to a teacher of theology. Because of the nature of the class's background he is forced to take into account the whole matter of relating theology in its proper order to life. As a result he is given a fuller and fresher insight into the very nature of theology and the specific tracts themselves. It intensifies his convictions on theology and stimulates him to a real appreciation of the rich contribution that theology has to make to Catholic life. In the matter of teaching itself, by sheer necessity, he is made to struggle in order to break down each argument into short clear steps without sacrificing accuracy or comprehensiveness. Both of these things will serve to make him a more effective teacher of theology for both seminarians and priests.

In conclusion, may I say that it was one of the most enjoyable classes that I have taught, and that it gave me a deep conviction that there is no need to bury theology in the napkin of a seminary and leave it there; but that by endeavoring to work out such a course one can eventually hope to make a real contribution to the life of the Church of America.

EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

It is said that the saintly and learned Cardinal Bellarmin found it far more laborious to write his child's catechism . . . than to compose some of his most profound works on theology.

—From "Our School Managers," an unsigned article in *AER* I, 1 (Jan. 1889), p. 23.

THE WAY OF THE CROSS AND THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

Christ crucified is not only the central and focal point of Catholicism, but of the whole history of the world. To that love-wounded Man on the cross all pre-Christian history moved in eager anticipation; and today, and for all ages, men will look back toward the figure of the Crucified and from that Man of Sorrows interpret and give meaning to their own personal lives and to all the world in which they live. Even as all men are engaged in a certain circulatory system, the *regiratio* of St. Thomas, by which they come from and go back to God, so, in a similar manner do all those redeemed by Christ proceed from and go back to Him on the Cross—and this in both the ontological and in the historical order. Christ crucified is the hub of the Christian, *i.e.,* Catholic world. And the whole world, as on the rim of a wheel, comes out from and points back to the one Christ, and to Him Crucified.

Hence, all our Catholic faith has its deepest meaning when connected with the sacrificial Christ, the High Priest and Victim, both in one divine Person made Man. And Calvary has two sides. From the one point of view, it is an act of justice, the paying of a debt through vicarious satisfaction. But, from another, perhaps, more important point of view, the Cross is a great act of love; for satisfaction for sin cannot adequately explain the prodigality of love-suffering that we see in the wounded Christ. To explain Calvary, love must enter in.

Calvary is much more than a substitute paying the devil-jailor a ransom price. It is not this at all, for the devil has never been a prison warder of men, though men may have done their all to serve him. But, through our incorporation, through our solidarity with Christ, we, too, have died and our life is buried with Christ in God. Through our being made sharers in His sacrifice, Christ has led us into His own relations with the Father; He has made us a race of giants. Calvary is really the seal of God's love-plan for men, never a symbol of shame. Tears it can bring to the eyes of men, but not despair. It is our hope, for it is the throne of the Sacred Heart. Children of Mother Church, we must ever cherish our Mother's birthplace; and that womb from which she issued is Christ on His Cross.

Though Christ died once for all, yet, if one may thus speak, His death lives on in the Church. For the Mass is Calvary, bereft of its bloody element; yet, the sacrifice is the same as that which Christ there offered for us all. Without Calvary and the death of Christ thereon, the Mass is impossible; a mere symbol without a reality behind it. Hence, without Calvary, there is no Mass.

Further, the Blessed Sacrament is the infinite fruit and flower of the Holy Mass. For without the Mass, there would be no Holy Eucharist, even as, without a mother, there would be no child. Hence, the Blessed Sacrament must be interpreted in terms of the Mass, since it is from the Mass that our sacramental Lord Jesus Christ becomes present on our altars.

We see, then, that, without the Passion and Calvary, there is no Mass; and, again, without the Mass, there is no Blessed Sacrament. Hence, without Calvary and the Cross, there is no Holy Eucharist.

With this background, we should like to consider a point quite practical for the present day. This is the problem of making the Stations of the Cross while the Blessed Sacrament is exposed to the veneration of the faithful. We shall make no attempt at offering any definitive solution to the problem. We should like to point out the relationship between the Stations and the Blessed Sacramen on the altar of exposition.

In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for September, 1945 (pp. 223 f.), Fr. Lallou remarks very correctly:

> However [though there is no positive legislation to the contrary], the entire legislation of the Church regulating the solemn exposition of the Blessed Sacrament argues against the propriety *of turning away from the altar of exposition* even for so salutary a purpose as that of making the Way of the Cross. While exposition is in progress, the evident mind of the Church is that *all in the presence of the Sanctissimum be occupied in the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament* (italics ours).

Now, it seems, that there is an assumption here that making the Stations is a "turning away from the altar of exposition," and that a person making the Way of the Cross is not "occupied in the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament."

Let us examine these two concepts, that we may perhaps arrive at a happy mean. As we have seen, the Blessed Sacrament has its reality and meaning from the Sacrifice of the Mass. And the Mass, in turn, looks back to Calvary as to its source. Hence, the Stations of the Cross turn the devout soul to the source of both the Mass and the Blessed Sacrament. It is a devotion that is intimately concerned with the Blessed Sacrament. Our contention is this: instead of turning the devout soul from the altar of exposition, the Stations, properly made, should necessarily turn the soul, and with a heart grateful with love, towards the Blessed Sacrament. For, in the Way of the Cross, the Catholic meditates upon that which was the price the Son of God chose freely to lay down, in order that the Blessed Sacrament be made possible.

Hence, in the Stations the devout soul can be engaged in the "adoration of the Blessed Sacrament." For here the soul is brought close into contact with the radical reason for the Blessed Sacrament's very existence there high above the altar; and the soul may well be brought to realize more fully how the sacred Host found its way into the beautiful monstrance from which our sacramental Lord blesses His loving worshippers.

We should like to see our people more deeply instructed with regard to the close and intimate relation existing between the Cross and the Mass, between Calvary and the Blessed Sacrament. Perhaps, were such instruction more widespread, absence from Holy Mass and failure to receive the Holy Eucharist at each Mass attended might well be diminished.

Today, in many churches there is daily, and often all day long, exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. Were we to prohibit the making of the Way of the Cross in such churches, might not real harm, at least an omission of a fervent exercise of divine charity in the making of the Stations, result?

In churches where exposition is infrequent, such would not be the case. Here, perhaps, it would be better for one not to make the Way of the Cross during exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. But, even here there are always the particular circumstances and personal traits and soul dispositions of the individual to be considered. And, again, there is the matter of charity. Were the one making the Stations to distract those adoring, in a different manner, the Blessed Sacrament, naturally the common good is to have precedence.

However, it still seems tenable that, at least, an individual might well make the Way of the Cross during exposition of the Blessed

Sacrament and, after having considered the Passion and Death of Christ on the Cross, be better disposed for the completion of the Holy Hour in a more devout manner.

We should all strive that the faithful be brought to a more perfect realization—not just awareness—of the intimate relation between Calvary, the Mass, and Holy Communion. The Stations of the Cross (apart from the plenary indulgences attached thereto) can serve as an excellent instrument for a proper appreciation of the Mass and Holy Communion. Christ Crucified not only gives meaning to the Mass and the Blessed Sacrament, but also makes mankind, the world, and all that exists have a real significance. "For it has pleased God the Father that in him all his fullness should dwell, and through him he should reconcile to himself all things, whether on the earth or in the heavens, making peace through the blood of his cross" (*Col.* 1:19-20).

MALACHY J. DONNELLY, S.J.

St. Mary's College,
St. Mary's, Kansas.

CARDINAL GIBBONS ON THE STUDY OF MEN

I was never more impressed with the impulse given to knowledge by contact with learned men, than during the Vatican Council, when prelates of world-wide experience and close observation were assembled in Rome. Each bishop brought with him an intimate acquaintance with the history of his country, and with the religious, social, and political condition of the people among whom he lived. One could learn more from a few hours' interview with those living encyclopaedias, than from a week's study of books. An earnest conversation with those keen-sighted churchmen, on the social and moral progress of their respective countries, was as much more delightful and instructive than the reading in print, as a personal inspection of an International Exposition would be in comparison with a description of it in the pages of an illustrated periodical. The living words left an indelible impress on the heart and memory.

—James Cardinal Gibbons, *The Ambassador of Christ* (Baltimore: John Murphy Co., 1896), p. 261.

THE TRUE CHURCH AND THE NOTES OF THE CHURCH

"How do we know that the Catholic Church is the one true Church established by Christ?" Thus reads question 153 in the Revised Baltimore Catechism. Upon our ability to answer this question effectively and accurately depend the spiritual welfare of our own people and the progress of our missionary effort. As Catholics we know that the scientifically assured and demonstrated answer to that question exists in the teaching of our Church. As teachers, however (and every priest is necessarily and pre-eminently a teacher), it must be our business to know how to give that answer. Moreover, we must be able to give it in such a way that those to whom our teaching is addressed will be able to profit from it, and may be able to see the God-given evidence that ours is the true Church of Christ.

The Revised Baltimore Catechism answers its own question with an appeal to the four marks or notes of the Church. It states that "We know that the Catholic Church is the one true Church established by Christ because it alone has the marks of the true Church." In answering the two subsequent questions it defines the marks of the Church as "certain clear signs by which all men can recognize it as the true Church founded by Jesus Christ," and informs us that "The chief marks of the Church are four: It is one, holy, catholic or universal, and apostolic." After explaining why each of these qualities can be predicated of the Catholic Church, the Catechism terminates this section of Christian Doctrine with the answer to question 160: "We know that no other church but the Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ because no other church has these four marks."

Thus the Revised Baltimore Catechism expresses itself as fully confident that the proof from the four marks or notes of the Church can show "all men" that the Catholic Church is the one true Church instituted by our Lord. It considers the *via notarum* as an effective demonstration, even apart from the *via historica,* which shows the identity of the Catholic Church with the organized religious society to which our Lord's immediate disciples belonged, and apart from the *via empirica,* which deals with the existent Catholic Church as a manifest miracle of the social order, and thus as a "great and perpetual motive of credibility and an unshakeable evidence of its own divine messengership."[1]

A great number of distinguished and highly competent modern theologians have treated the *via notarum* as a fully and independently effective argument for the Catholic Church's position as our Lord's own society. In this group we find such authors as Hurter,[2] Mazzella,[3] Herrmann,[4] Egger,[5] Billot,[6] D'Herbigny,[7] Pesch,[8] Michelitsch,[9] Felder,[10] Bainvel,[11] Van Noort,[12] Zubizarreta,[13] Bartmann,[14] Berry,[15] Brunsmann,[16] Tepe,[17] MacGuiness,[18] Paris,[19] and Schultes.[20] There is, of course, no such thing as any one uniform method of treating the notes of the Church to be found in the writings of these modern theologians. These men handle their material in different ways and they manage to achieve strikingly different degrees of effectiveness. Yet, amidst this diversity of treatment, they all manifest their confidence in the *via notarum* as a correct and efficacious apologetical process.

---

[1] *Vatican Council,* Sess. III, chap. 3 *(DB* 1794).

[2] Cf. *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium* (Innsbruck, 1878), I, 262 ff.

[3] Cf. *De religione et Ecclesia praelectiones scholastico-dogmaticae* (Prato, 1905), pp. 639 ff.

[4] Cf. *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* (Lyons and Paris: E. Vitte, 1937), I, 427 ff.

[5] Cf. *Enchiridion theologiae dogmaticae generalis* (Brixen, 1932), pp. 526 ff.

[6] Cf. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi sive continuatio theologiae de Verbo Incarnato* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1921), pp. 135 ff.

[7] Cf. *Theologica de Ecclesia* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1928), II, 29 ff.

[8] Cf. *Praelectiones dogmaticae* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1924), I, 285 ff.

[9] Cf. *Elementa apologeticae sive theologiae fundamentalis* (Graz and Vienna, 1925), pp. 285 ff.

[10] Cf. *Apologetica sive theologia fundamentalis* (Paderborn, 1923), II, 154 ff.

[11] Cf. *De Ecclesia Christi* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1925), pp. 49 f.

[12] Cf. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi* (Amsterdam, 1913), pp. 130 ff.

[13] Cf. *Theologia dogmatico-scholastica ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis* (Bilbao, 1937), I, 338 ff.

[14] Cf. *Précis de théologie dogmatique,* traduit par l'Abbé Marcel Gautier (Mulhouse, France, 1936), II, 204 ff.

[15] Cf. *The Church of Christ. An Apologetic and Dogmatic Treatise* (St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1927), pp. 146 ff.

[16] Cf. *A Handbook of Fundamental Theology,* freely adapted and edited by Arthur Preuss (St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1931), III, 409 f.

[17] Cf. *Institutiones theologicae in usum scholarum* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1894), pp. 317 ff.

[18] Cf. *Commentarii theologici* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1930), I, 263 ff.

[19] Cf. *Ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis tractatus de Ecclesia Christi ad usum studentium theologiae fundamentalis* (Turin: Marietti, 1929), pp. 74 ff.

Still other competent theologians, however, have placed no such reliance on the proof from the notes of the Church. Speaking of this demonstration, Tanquerey-Bord says brusquely: *"Hodie vero Protestantes minime convincit."*[21] In a similar vein, Martin Jugie, the greatest modern Catholic authority on the doctrines of the dissident Orientals, insists that the *via notarum* is of little use in explaining the Roman Church's prerogatives to the members of the dissident assemblies.[22] Dieckmann[23] and Lercher[24] give the demonstration from the notes of the Church but show themselves quite diffident about its efficacy. Cotter does not employ it at all.[25] Schouppe,[26] Dorsch,[27] Straub,[28] and Hervé[29] use the notes of the Church together with the argument from the Petrine primacy, the strongest element in the *via historica.* Yelle and Fournier use the three methods very effectively.[30]

---

[20] Cf. *De Ecclesia catholica praelectiones apologeticae* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1931), pp. 160 ff. The same author showed himself quite critical of the *via notarum* in an article in *Divus Thomas,* I (1914), pp. 57 ff.

[21] *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae* (Paris, Tournai, and Rome: Desclée, 1937), I, 516.

[22] *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium ab ecclesia catholica Dissidentium* (Paris: Letouzey and Ané, 1931), IV, 591.

[23] Cf. *De Ecclesia tractatus historico-dogmatici* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1925), I, 511.

[24] *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* (Innsbruck: Rauch, 1934), I, 449 f.

[25] Cf. *Theologia fundamentalis* (Weston, Massachusetts: Weston College, 1940), p. 391.

[26] *Elementa theologiae dogmaticae* (Lyons and Paris, 1861), I, 186 ff.

[27] Cf. *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis* (Innsbruck: Rauch, 1928), II, 637 ff.

[28] Cf. *De ecclesia Christi* (Innsbruck, 1894), pp. 743 ff.

[29] Cf. *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Bookshop, 1943), I, 374 ff. Hervé also employs the hierarchical nature of the Church as a quasi note.

Strangely enough, the sharpest attack on the validity of the proof from the notes of the Church comes from Dr. Gustave Thils, the theologian who has done the most towards explaining the history and the various forms of this demonstration. Dr. Thils holds that, even granting the efficacy of the proof from the notes of the Church, such a proof is neither simple nor easy, and certainly not adapted to all the faithful.[31] Moreover, he shows a serious lack of confidence in the force of the demonstration itself.

The learned professor from Malines reduces the proof from the notes of the Church to syllogistic form. The major of this syllogism is the assertion that our Lord endowed His Church with certain characteristics which should permit us to recognize it amidst all the Christian groups. The minor tells us that these characteristics are found in the Roman Catholic Church. Dr. Thils holds that, during the course of recent theological history, ecclesiologists have presented the minor premise in three different ways. Sometimes they have made an *absolute* assertion, affirming without any restriction that these notes belong to the Church of Rome. At other times they have given the minor premise in *comparative* form, holding that the four notes exist in the Roman Church more perfectly than they do in non-Roman communions. Dr. Thils holds that our theologians present the minor premise in the proof from the notes of the Church in a *negative* manner when they content themselves with showing that the four qualities employed by the First Ecumenical Council of Constantinople do not exist in religious societies other than the Catholic Church.[32]

Dr. Thils passes a very severe judgment on the *via notarum.* He claims that its major premise has never been rigorously demonstrated, and that it fails to justify completely its declarations on the existence, the number, and the nature of the notes themselves. He believes that the minor premise, in whatever form it may be found, has serious and easily ascertainable shortcomings. As he sees it, the demonstration from the notes of the Church, taken as a unit, is a sadly ineffective instrument for bringing people to realize the status of the Catholic Church as the true Church of our Lord Jesus Christ.

---

[30] Cf. *Apologetica* (Montreal: Grand Séminaire, 1945), pp. 191 ff.

[31] Cf. *Les notes de l'Église dans l'Apologétique Catholique depuis la Reforme* (Gembloux, Belgium: J. Duculot, 1937), p. 342; cf. also the article by the same author *"La 'via notarum' et l'apologétique contemporaine" (Angelicum,* XVI, 1[Jan. 1939], pp. 24 ff.).

[32] Cf. *Les notes de l'église,* p. 81.

It is obviously important for us to know whether or not Dr. Thils has adequately and accurately evaluated the *via notarum*. In order to have this knowledge, we must understand something about the way in which and the purpose for which the proof from the notes of the Church was originally conceived. With this historical information once gained, we should have little difficulty in seeing in what way and to what end the demonstration from the four notes of the Church is manifestly and fully effective.

Catholic theologians began to use the *via notarum*, in its existent form, during the course of the sixteenth century. Such is the constant teaching of Dr. Thils, and such is the evidence from the history of sacred theology. The precise point of this beginning in the sixteenth century, however, is unfortunately not too well set forth in many explanations of the history of the notes.

In the first place, the men of the sixteenth century were by no means the first to appeal to qualities visible in the true Church of Jesus Christ as evidence justifying their attachment to that Church. As a matter of fact, some of the earliest and most effective of the Counter-Reformation ecclesiologists incorporated into their own works passages taken bodily from the writings of the Fathers, indicating visible characteristics of the Catholic Church which manifested that Church as the society within which every man who seeks to live as a follower of Christ should dwell. Passages of this kind were to be found in the writings of Saints Irenaeus, Augustine, Jerome, Optatus, and Vincent of Lerins.

St. Irenaeus had taught that the true faith, the veritable message of our Lord, was to be found in the apostolic Churches, and especially in the apostolic Roman Church, with which, because of its *"potior principalitas,"* every Church which preserved the apostolic tradition was to be united.[33] Listing the factors which held him as a member of the Catholic Church and kept him from association in the conventicles of heretics, St. Augustine had spoken of a "most sincere wisdom" existent within the true Church, an "agreement of peoples and of nations," an "authority, begun by miracles, nourished by hope, increased by charity, confirmed by age," a "succession of priests from the very see of Peter the Apostle . . . to the present episcopate," and finally "the Catholic name itself."[34] The "wisdom" found within the Church, in other words the flowering of the divine life of grace within the Catholic society, was presented as something which should influence Catholics to remain within the Church. St. Augustine seems to admit that it has no probative value in manifesting the truth of the Church to non-Catholics, since these do not believe that it exists in the Church. The other four factors, however, by their very nature, are such that they can be seen and appreciated even by those outside the fold.

---

[33] Cf. *Adversus haereses*, 3, 3 (*MPG*, VII, 848 f.).

St. Jerome had used the name and the origin of the Church as signs of its truth.

> We ought to remain in that Church which was founded by the apostles and which continues to this day. If you ever hear of any that are called Christians taking their name not from the Lord Jesus Christ but from some other, as for instance Marcionites, Valentinians, men of the mountains or of the plain, you may be sure that you have there not the Church of Christ but the synagogue of Antichrist. For the fact that they took their origin after the foundation of the Church is proof that they are those whose coming the Apostle foretold.[35]

St. Vincent of Lerins had taught that a man would hold the orthodox faith within the Catholic Church when he held to entirety, antiquity, and agreement.[36] St. Optatus of Milevis had appealed to the catholicity of the Church in showing "which is the one Church called by Christ His Dove and His Bride." Furthermore he makes use of five endowments *(dotes)* of the Church in arguing against the Donatists. These five endowments, which the Donatists themselves admitted as adornments of the Church, were the *Cathedra, Angelus, Spiritus, Fons Signatus,* and the *Sigillum.* The *Cathedra* is the See of Peter, and the true Church is the one in communion with the legitimate successor of the Prince of the Apostles.[37]

---

[34] Cf. *Contra epistulam Manichaei quam vocant fundamenti,* 4 *(CSEL,* XXV, 196; *MPL,* XLII, 175).

[35] *Dialogus contra Luciferianos (MPL,* XXIII, 181 f.).

[36] Cf. *Commonitorium* 2 *(MPL,* L, 640).

[37] Cf. *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam,* 2 *(CSEL,* XXVI, 32 ff., *MPL,* XI, 941 ff.).

Furthermore, when we say that the scholastic argument from the notes of the Church originated during the sixteenth century, we by no means imply that the theologians of the sixteenth century were the first to teach that the four qualities enumerated by the First Ecumenical Council of Constantinople are to be found in the Catholic society and in no other. This doctrine had been a commonplace in Catholic ecclesiology since the thirteenth century. St. Thomas Aquinas had listed four *conditiones* of the Church, unity, holiness, catholicity, and a firmness due to its divine foundation and to its apostolicity.[38] He insisted that these *conditiones* belonged to the Catholic Church alone. The fourteenth century ecclesiologist James of Viterbo had indicated no less than ten factors contributing to the "glory" of the true Church.[39] These ten qualities, he said, could be reduced to the four *conditiones* set forth in the Creed of Constantinople. The fifteenth century Cardinal John de Turrecremata had designated these same four qualities, not only as *conditiones* but as *proprietates,* as pertaining to the Catholic Church and to no other religious society.[40] Thomas Netter of Walden had appealed to these four qualities in his arguments against the Wyclifites, but had relied mainly on demonstrations from the Church's unity, catholicity, and apostolicity.[41]

Despite the fact that the Catholic ecclesiologists of the sixteenth century were not the first to appeal to visible qualities inherent in the Catholic Church in defending her status as the true Church of Jesus Christ, and despite the fact that they were not the first to teach that the four qualities enumerated in the Creed of Constantinople are actually properties of the Catholic Church, they were the originators of the *via notarum.* The demonstration from the notes of the Church is something far more radical and specialized than a mere appeal to the Church's visible qualities. It is a triumphant refutation of one specific attack on the Church, an attack which began with the Protestant Reformation.

What distinguished the Protestant groups from the various heretical societies which had preceded them, and what fashioned them into the most formidable adversaries that have ever been ranged against the Church of God, was one ingenious thesis in the field of ecclesiology. Earlier heretical societies had gone their own individual ways and held their own individual tenets, separating themselves, theoretically at least, as thoroughly from other erroneous assemblies as from the true Church. It remained for the Lutherans, and for Calvin, and for their followers, to concoct and to adopt a scheme which would give plausibility and consistency to the spectacle of doctrinal variety itself. That scheme was the hypothesis of a twofold church, the one visible and the other invisible. The Protestant theory of the notes of the church was an essential part of this scheme. The Catholic demonstration from the notes of the Church, the *via notarum,* provided the evidence which showed the error of this basic Protestant contention.

---

[38] Cf. *Expositio super symbolum apostolorum* (Mandonnet's edition of the *Opuscula omnia* [Paris: Lethielleux, 1927]) IV, 378 ff.

[39] Cf. *De regimine Christiano* (Arquillière's critical edition [Paris: Beauchesne, 1926]) pp. 100 ff.

[40] Cf. *Summa de Ecclesia* (Venice, 1560), chapters 6-19, pp. 7^v ff.

[41] Cf. *Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei Ecclesiae Catholicae* (Venice, 1571), I, 190 ff.

Both the Lutherans and the Calvinists insisted that the true Church of Christ was basically an invisible society. By the term "the true Church of Jesus Christ" both these men and their Catholic opponents understood the group which was the recipient of our Lord's promises, the assembly which He and His disciples called the *Ecclesia.* The true Church was the body of men against which the gates of hell would not prevail. It was the Kingdom of God, within which our Lord was to remain forever. It was the Church of Christ, and the men who did not belong to it were to constitute a loosely organized church of Satan, the "world," gathered under "the prince of this world," to fight against our Lord and His followers.

It was the contention of the Lutherans that this true Church consisted of men and women in the state of grace.[42] The Calvinists held that only the predestined belonged to it.[43] Both parties, in other words, taught that in order to be a Christian, in the sense in which this term is used in the Acts of the Apostles, in order to be a true disciple or follower of Christ and to be in His company, it was not *primarily* requisite to live in any organized religious society at all.

---

[42] Cf. *The Confession of Augsburg,* "They [The Lutherans] teach that the one Holy Church will remain forever. Now this Church is the congregation of the saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments rightly administered." Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church* (Oxford University Press, 1943), p. 295.

[43] Cf. *The Westminster Confession of Faith,* "The Catholic or universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect . . . The visible Church which is also Catholic or universal under the Gospel, consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children. (Bettenson, *op. cit.,* p. 348).

There was nothing particularly new about these contentions. They had been the stock in trade of various heretics from the time of Montanus down to the days of Wyclif and Huss. What made the Reformation heresiarchs' attack on the true Church more dangerous than previous onslaughts had been was that none of them attempted to identify his own organization with this imaginary invisible Church. The Reformers were anxious to put up a concerted fight against the Catholic Church, and they found the instrument for this campaign in their own theory on the notes of the Church.

That theory, as elaborated by the Lutherans and adopted by the Calvinists, was embodied in the assertion that the true Church existed wherever the Gospel was preached sincerely and the sacraments were properly administered.[44] The just and the predestined were depicted as being free to enter into any visible religious society wherein these two characteristics could be found. Such societies were presented as being fit assemblies for Christians, organizations within which the followers of Christ could unite to work for their common interests. The sincere preaching of the Gospel and the proper administration of the sacraments were thus the Protestant notes of the Church.

The sincere preaching of the Gospel, according to Reformation theory, demanded accuracy only in the statement of essential or primary doctrines of Christianity, and allowed error and disagreement on accidentals. The determination was made by a sort of "greatest common factor" method. The teachings on which Protestant religious groups agreed were, *ipso facto,* elevated to the status of primary Christian doctrines. Matters on which they differed automatically became designated as accidentals.

The Protestant notes of the Church thus became the foundation of a kind of religious "tolerance." No individual Protestant assembly could claim to constitute the Church of God in its own right. Each one claimed for itself and recognized in others only the pretension to be an apt and fitting dwelling for men and women who were Christians by virtue of the life of grace or by predestination. Thus the Protestant notes of the Church do not claim the prerogatives of the visible Catholic Church for any heretical religious organization. Rather they are part of a system which claims these gifts for an unorganized body of men and women, for those in the state of grace or for the predestined.

---

[44] Cf. Calvin's *Institutio Christianae religionis,* Lib. IV, cap. 1, n. 9 (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1874), II, 207.

In opposing this error through the use of the real *via notarum* the Catholic theologians of the sixteenth century took cognizance of those religious truths which their Protestant opponents accepted. The Reformers recognized the early Saints, the Fathers and the Doctors of the Church as true disciples of Christ. They claimed to follow the teaching of the early Church. Most important of all, they accepted the Bible as God's word. With this in mind the Catholic controversialists worked to draw from the Scriptures, and from ancient patristic and conciliar writings all that they could find to show that being a Christian in the proper sense of the term, being a true disciple or follower of Christ, being in the company of Christ, meant belonging to the visible society which our Lord had organized around Himself, the society within which He still lives and rules and which we know as the Roman Catholic Church.

John Driedo stated the central issue of the sixteenth century religious controversy clearly and accurately. Echoing the words of St. Augustine he says that "there is an ancient controversy between the heretics and the true Christians about where the true Church of Christ is and with whom it dwells."[45] He notes that there are two different Churches opposing one another, each one claiming that it wishes to remain in the faith of our Saviour, to abide by the evangelical and apostolic teachings and to possess the Christian religion. The issue is between two Churches. If the claim of one of these groups is justified, that of the other is not. If one of these really is the Church of Christ, and actually possesses the qualifications it claims to have, then the other is the body, or at least belongs to the body which is set against the Church of Christ, and which fights in some way under the direction of the prince of this world.

---

[45] Cf. Driedo's *De ecclesiasticis scripturis et dogmatibus,* Lib. IV, cap. 2 (Louvain, 1533), p. 503. Driedo uses an adaptation of the words of St. Augustine's *De unitate Ecclesiae,* cap. 2.

Driedo sets out to prove that "the true Church of Christ is with those who remain in that Church which was founded by the apostles, which began to grow out of Jerusalem, spreading to all nations, and which endures to this day."[46] He advances ten *sententiae* to demonstrate this proposition. The ten *sententiae* center around the evidence that the true Church of Christ is an organized body, containing both good and bad men in this world, that it is apostolic, and necessarily connected with the See of Peter, that it is united in one sacrament of faith, and that its status as the group within which our Lord dwells can be demonstrated through an appeal to the scriptures. Driedo's proof, as stated and explained under the heading of his ten *sententiae,* is perfectly cogent. It is capable of showing a man who acknowledges the existence of a group which has the right to the name of Christian that this group is nothing more or less than the visible Catholic Church. Driedo organized his demonstration well, but made no attempt to hinge his teachings on any definite number of characteristics existent within the Catholic Church.

Ruard Tapper, on the other hand, appeals explicitly to the classical passages from St. Augustine and St. Vincent of Lerins in demonstrating that "the Church in which we have been born again to Christ, in which we have received the sacraments, and in which we have been instructed from our earliest years is that true Catholic Church outside of which there is no salvation."[47] Like Driedo, Tapper teaches that this claim can be verified through an examination of the scriptures. For Peter Soto, unity is the great sign of the true Church. Soto insisted that the true Church of the Christians is indubitably the one which existed long ago "in the apostles and disciples, to the number of about a hundred, who were gathered in Jerusalem after the ascension, and who there received the Holy Ghost." The ones who remain in that unity constitute the body of the Christians. The others, those who have left it, are joined with the antichrist described in the First Epistle of St. John.[48]

---

[46] Cf. Driedo, *op. cit.,* p. 527.

[47] Cf. Tapper's *Oratio secunda, De Ecclesiae unitate, et quod vera Christi Ecclesia est apud nos Catholicos,* in the *Opera omnia* (Cologne, 1582), pp. 332 ff. Tapper calls the "notes" taken from Vincent of Lerins *"signa certissima."*

John Hessels appeals to the authority of St. Irenaeus, and uses the Catholicity of the Church, and its apostolicity, as signs showing that the visible Catholic Church is the Church of the Christians.[49] In his *Demonstratio methodica,* the great Thomas Stapleton uses universality, perpetuity, and conspicuous clarity as notes of the true Church.[50] In the later book, the *Relectio scholastica,* he offers a somewhat different listing. Here the notes are antiquity, succession, universality and unity.[51]

Christopher Holiwood taught that the Catholic Church could be shown to be the true Church of Jesus Christ by the fact of its status as the historically demonstrable continuation of the apostolic society.[52] In a later edition of his book he indicated five signs or marks which rendered the exclusive claim of the Church evident. These five marks were faith, morals, extension in place, extension in time, and glorious works.[53] Nicholas Sander had listed six notes, the Church's depth and sublimity, its splendor and clarity, its extension, its duration, its unity, and its constancy.[54]

Suarez named ten properties of the Church by which a man could demonstrate its status as the true Church of Jesus Christ, even apart from those other arguments which certify the correctness of its faith. These ten notes were the Church's catholicity, its duration, the agreement of peoples and nations, its unity, its holiness, its apostolicity, the gift of prophecy and of miracles, the ordered government of the Church, its legitimate use of the sacraments, and its legitimate use of Scripture.[55] Gregory of Valentia[56] and Adam Tanner[57] considered as notes of the true Church the four properties attributed to the Church in the Creed of Constantinople and two others, the order existent in the Church, and its visibility. St. Robert Bellarmine, reminding his reader that the note of the Church leads to a conclusion "evidently credible" rather than "evidently true" for those who do not accept the Scriptures as God's word, employs no less than fifteen of these marks.[58] These are the Catholic name, the Church's antiquity, its uninterrupted duration, the number and variety of its adherents, the succession of its bishops from the apostles, its agreement with the faith of the apostles, the union of its members, the holiness of its teaching, the efficacy of its teaching, the holy lives of its great teachers, its miracles, its prophecies, the admissions of its enemies, the dreadful fate of those who oppose it, and finally the temporal felicity of its protectors. St. Robert, however, taught that these demonstrations might be arranged around the four marks of unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity. Thus he lent the pressure of his influence towards the tendency to limit the number of notes to these four.

---

[48] Cf. *Assertio Catholicae fidei circa articulos confessionis nomine illustrissimi Ducis Wirtenbergensis oblatae per legatos eius Concilio Tridentino* (Cologne, 1555), *sectio de Ecclesia.* The sections and the pages of this edition are not numbered.

[49] Cf. *Brevis et Catholica symboli apostolici explicatio* (Louvain, 1562), pp. 30v ff.

[50] Cf. *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium demonstratio methodica* (Paris, 1579), pp. 104 ff.

[51] Cf. *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium relectio scholastica et compendiaria* (Antwerp, 1596), pp. 70 ff.

[52] Cf. *De investiganda vera ac visibili Christi Ecclesia tractatus,* (Antwerp, 1619), p. 25. Holiwood used the Latinized form of his name, Christophorus a Sacrobosco, as a signature for his book.

[53] Cf. *op. cit.,* pp. 75 ff.

[54] Cf. *De visibili monarchia Ecclesiae* (Louvain, 1571), p. 793.

Earlier in the sixteenth century both Michael Vehe[59] and Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius[60] had designated these four properties as notes of the Church. This manner of listing the notes soon triumphed over the more complicated methods. John Wiggers took pains to show that the various elements in St. Augustine's celebrated argument for the Church could all be explained in terms of the four properties set forth at Constantinople,[61] and Francis Sylvius argued that all arrangements of the notes could be reduced to this one.[62] Later in the seventeenth century the brothers Adrian and Peter van Walenburch used another set of four notes, unity, miracles, the diffusion of the Church and the perpetual succession of teachers within it,[63] but after their time the demonstration from the notes of the Church was, for all practical purposes, restricted to the arrangement sponsored by Vehe and Hosius.

---

[55] Cf. *Opus de triplici virtute theologica, fide, spe, et charitate* (Lyons, 1621), p. 177.

[56] Cf. *Commentarii theologici* (Ingolstadt, 1603), III, col. 184 ff.

[57] Cf. *Theologia scholastica* (Ingolstadt, 1627), III, col. 156.

[58] Cf. *De controversiis Christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos* (Inglostadt, 1586), I, col. 1338 ff.

[59] Cf. *Assertio sacrorum quorundam axiomatum, quae a nonnullis nostri seculi pseudo prophetis in periculosam rapiuntur controversiam* (Leipzig, 1535), Tract. I, cap. 2. The pages of this edition are not numbered.

[60] Cf. *Confessio Catholicae fidei Christiana,* in the *Opera omnia* (Cologne, 1584), pp. 29 ff.

[61] Cf. *Commentaria de virtutibus theologicis, fide, spe, et charitate* (Louvain, 1689), pp. 120 ff.

The *via notarum* as these men employed it was a perfectly effective demonstration. It was addressed to men who professed themselves willing to follow the teaching of Scripture and of the Fathers, and who wanted to be associated with our Lord in the same way that the primitive Christians were joined to Him. Throughout all of its various individual arrangements, the demonstration from the notes of the true Church gave these men ample evidence that the Church of the promises, the company of the Christians, was, on the authority of Scripture and of the Fathers, essentially an organized and visible society, the visible society which they knew as the Catholic Church. Men like St. Robert and Francis Sylvius did not waste their time in using this comparatively complex process to prove something self-evident, the fact that as individual societies the various Protestant religious assemblies had not been established by our Lord during the course of His public life in this world. This fact was taken in as one element of their demonstration. They were engaged in polemic, not against one individual religious group nor against a mere union of societies. They were trying, in the interests of divine truth, to overcome an erroneous system, the system in which the Protestant teaching on the notes of the Church formed the key position. In showing that the Fathers of Constantinople had declared the visible Church over which they ruled as the Church of the faith, in presenting the formulae of St. Augustine and of the other patristic writers, the Counter-Reformation theologians were offering ample proof that, to be in the company of Christ, or to be a Christian, a disciple in the strict sense of the term, a man had to belong to the visible Church.

---

[62] Cf. *De praecipuis fidei nostrae orthodoxae controversiis cum nostris haereticis,* in the *Opera omnia* (Antwerp, 1698), pp. 256 ff.

[63] Cf. *Professio fidei Catholicae,* in Migne's *Theologiae cursus completus* I, col. 1004 ff. This *Professio* is sometimes ascribed to Francis Veronius, S.J.

The weakness which Dr. Thils and other modern theologians have remarked in the modern use of the *via notarum* arises, not from any defect in the process itself, but rather from a faulty use of this process. In certain modern works there is a tendency to depict the Catholic Church and dissident religious organizations as claiming the same dignity, and to treat the *via notarum* as a kind of magic instrument for deciding the contest in favor of the Catholic Church. Thus the notes of the Church are considered as standards awarding the prerogatives of our Lord's true Church to the Catholic Church rather than, let us say, to the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Actually, of course, there is no such contest. The Catholic Church's prerogatives as the true Church of Christ are not claimed in the name of any non-Catholic religious society, or even for the sum-total of these societies. They are claimed for an invisible church of the just or of the predestined. All that the modern Protestant bodies claim, and all that any such visible organization ever claimed, is the status of a society organized for the furtherance of the common interests of persons who seek their salvation as members of this invisible church. The Catholic *via notarum* shows that the Church of salvation is actually the visible society, the Catholic Church.

Furthermore, in recent years there has also been a tendency on the part of some authors to rely too much on a mere enumeration of the notes and an indication that they are found within the Church. After all, the essential work of the *via notarum* is to indicate that the visible Catholic Church is the true Church of Jesus Christ. The process is devoid of purpose and of meaning when the person to whom it is addressed is not aware of what the expression "true Church of Jesus Christ" really means. The classical masterpieces of ecclesiology all insisted upon the "names" of the Church, the various designations given to the Church by our Lord and by the Fathers. When they set out to prove that the Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ, they were demonstrating that it is the Kingdom of God, the City of God, the House and Temple of God, and our Lord's Mystical Body. They were showing that the Catholic Church is the Church of the faithful and that, in order to have the designation of disciple of Christ or of Christian, in the sense in which these terms appear in Scripture, a man must belong to the Catholic Church.

In the religious and secular literature of our own time, a tremendous amount of the force and meaning contained in the notion of the Church or the *Ecclesia* has been lost. We have become so prone to apply the name "church" to every religious organization that we forget that it was and is the pre-eminent title of the company within which our Lord dwells. We are so accustomed to hearing expressions like "the union of the Churches" that we are apt to forget that this manner of speech would have sounded like blasphemy to the men who first elaborated the argument from the notes of the Church. For them, and for their opponents in religious debate, there was manifestly only one Church of Christ, and one church of Satan. We can expect little good from the *via notarum* when it is advanced by the type of Catholic writer who will use the inherently contradictory expression, "orthodox Christians, both Protestant and Catholic."

It is encouraging to find a distinguished non-Catholic scholar like H. Burn-Murdoch protesting against the attenuated meaning attached to the word "church" in modern times.[64] Only when men come to realize the content and the implications of this word can they be in a position to profit from the *via notarum*.[65] Unless they have an idea of what the notion of the true Church of Jesus Christ really is, they will not appreciate what this process of proof has to show them. Once they come to learn that meaning, however, they will find in the proof from the notes of the Church one of the most fruitful portions of Catholic theology.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

---

[64] Cf. *Church, Continuity and Unity* (Cambridge, England: At the University Press, 1945), p. 8.

[65] Dr. Thils' diffidence towards the *via notarum* may, perhaps, be ascribed to his belief that modern theologians see only a contest between the Catholic Church and three rival religious organizations where their counter-Reformation predecessors described one great conflict between the Catholic Church and the *ecclesia sathanae* (cf. *op. cit.*, p. 5).

Answers to Questions

FACULTIES CONCERNING HOLY WEEK SERVICES FOR OUR ARMED FORCES

Question: What war-time faculties have been extended to our chaplains in service with the armed forces, permitting abbreviation or simplification of the Holy Week ceremonies?

Answer: Numerous faculties have been granted to our military and naval chaplains, in virtue of which they can celebrate the services of Holy Week in what may be described, in the words of our correspondent, as abbreviated or simplified fashion. The following are noteworthy:

(1) They may omit the Passion on week-days when it should be read, reciting in place of the gospel only the last part of the Passion. On Palm Sunday, instead of the Passion, they may read the gospel of the blessing of the palms.

(2) For the blessing of the palms, the chaplains are allowed to use an abbreviated form, consisting of the prayers *Petimus Domine sancte, Deus qui dispersa congregas,* and *Deus qui per olivae ramum,* at which point the palms are sprinkled with holy water and incensed and then distributed, the ceremony of blessing ending with the oration *Omnipotens sempiterne Deus.*

(3) To chaplains also has been extended the faculty, enjoyed by Bishops by provision of the *Codex Juris,* of celebrating Low Mass without the usual ceremonies of procession, etc., on Holy Thursday.

(4) There has been conceded also the extraordinary privilege of conducting a condensed form of the Good Friday services, beginning with the unveiling and adoration of the cross, after which the Sacred Host is brought to the altar and the rite of the Mass of the Presanctified is performed in the manner of a Low Mass, without chant and omitting incensations.

(5) In chapels on military reservations, reserved for the exclusive use of Catholics, the Holy Week services may be conducted according to the simple form prescribed by the *Memoriale Rituum* of Benedict XIII originally for use in parish churches where there are not available the clergy required for the solemn services. This faculty is granted our chaplains provided that proper reverence and decorum can be observed in the conduct of these functions.

These are a few of the war-time concessions concerning the abbreviation and simplification of the services of Holy Week in favor of those in the armed forces and those living in military reservations or in military hospitals.

The text of these faculties may be read in the decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation of April 9, 1941. (Cf. also the *Facultates Quinquennales* of the Sacred Congregation of Rites.)

HOLY THURSDAY REPOSITORY OR SEPULCHRE

Question: The altar, or chapel, to which the Sacred Host to be used in the Mass of the Presanctified is carried after the Mass on Holy Thursday, is usually called a repository but it is sometimes referred to as a sepulchre. The latter name does not seem appropriate since the period during which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved at this altar does not correspond with the time during which the Body of Our Lord rested in the sepulchre. Is there not some confusion in the use of the word, sepulchre, in this connection?

Answer: It is quite correct to refer to the altar of repose of the Blessed Sacrament, used between the Mass of Holy Thursday and the services of Good Friday, as either a repository or a sepulchre, as both the institution of the Blessed Sacrament and Our Lord's resting in the tomb are commemorated by it. This double significance of the Holy Thursday repository has the approval of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (Dec. 15, 1896). It is not lawful, however, according to this decree, to ornament the altar of repose, or sepulchre, with representations of Our Lady or St. John or Mary Magdalen or the soldiers on guard unless the local bishop considers that such figures should be tolerated on account of long-standing custom.

To call the altar of repose a sepulchre is indeed an anachronism as the time of Our Lord's resting in the tomb begins about, or even before, the hour when the repository is dismantled. It is probable that the appellation started out of confusion with a mediaeval rite, which is now generally obsolete, though it is said still to survive in the Diocese of Augsburg. According to this usage, three hosts were consecrated at the Mass of Holy Thursday. One of these was consumed in the Mass of that day, the second was reserved for the Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday, while the third was carried to an altar, properly designated as a sepulchre, to be enshrined there after the Good Friday services until Holy Saturday evening, when it was brought out as a dramatic symbol of the resurrection. The ancient English observance of this "burying" of the Sacred Host in the Easter Sepulchre is described at length by Fr. Herbert Thurston, S.J., in his *Lent and Holy Week* (pp. 454-72). It is interesting, in this connection, to remark that our Devotion of the Forty Hours owes the inspiration, at least of its extent, to the period of around forty hours during which Our Lord's Body rested in the tomb, between His burial and His resurrection.

THE EXTRAORDINARY REVERENCES TO THE HOLY OILS ON HOLY THURSDAY

Question: Why is it that such reverence is shown to the Holy Oils at the blessing on Maundy Thursday, such as the profound bow and the double genuflection with which the newly-consecrated Oil of the Catechumens and the Holy Chrism are saluted?

Answer: We have become accustomed to the genuflection as the special mark of reverence reserved to the Blessed Sacrament and so it seems strange that it be paid to any lesser object of veneration. Yet, at High Mass, all except the celebrant and prelates in attendance kneel to the cross even though the Blessed Sacrament is not reserved at the altar. From the unveiling of the crucifix on Good Friday to None of Holy Saturday, *i.e.,* to just before the services of the latter day, all, of whatever rank, genuflect when they pass the cross of the high altar (S.R.C. 3049, ad 5; 3059, ad 4). This special form of reverence towards the crucifix seems quite indicated for Good Friday, the day of days for particular veneration of the cross. At all seasons of the year, a relic of the True Cross is saluted with a genuflection by those who pass in front of it. Indeed, although the practice is not commonly followed in the United States, a bishop officiating or presiding at liturgical functions is recognized by all but the celebrant and prelates by a genuflection rather than a bow of the head *(Caer. Ep.,* Lib. I, Cap. XVIII, 3). The double genuflection, ordinarily made only before the Blessed Sacrament solemnly exposed, is the proper reverence to be paid to the Blessed Sacrament, enshrined in the repository on Holy Thursday, although it is not then solemnly exposed. This special form of adoration seems most appropriate for the day which is the original feast of the Holy Eucharist, just as the genuflection to the cross is the becoming reverence for Good Friday.

These instances are cited in evidence that the genuflection is not always restricted to the Blessed Sacrament but is occasionally prescribed as the proper form of respect to be shown to objects other than the Sacred Species. Other examples will readily occur to one's mind, as, for example, bowing the knee at the *Verbum caro factum est* and remaining on the knees during the first verse of the *Ave maris stella*. With these things in mind, it is not difficult to account for the extraordinary reverences paid to the Holy Oils just after their blessing, reverences paid to them on no other occasion. In this connection, we may remark that the *Pontificale* (Pars II) definitely prescribes a genuflection by the twelve priests assisting at the blessing of the Oils only when they sing the *Ave sanctum Chrisma,* in salutation of the Holy Chrism, while for the Oil of Catechumens, it says simply that they salute the Holy Oil. Hence, old ceremonial writers, *v.g.,* Martinucci (Lib. VI, Cap. XIV, 139 n), decided that the genuflection was to be restriced to the greeting of the Holy Chrism, a simple bow of the head being the proper reverence to the Oil of Catechumens. The Sacred Congregation of Rites (4269 ad 14), however, has decreed that the genuflection is to be used on both occasions, *i.e.,* at the *Ave sanctum Chrisma* and at the *Ave sanctum Oleum.* Neither the *Pontificale* nor the Sacred Congregation has any prescription that the genuflection be a double one. The general custom favors the kneeling on both knees and this is supported by the authority of De Herdt (*Prax. Pont.,* III, n. 39). Martinucci (*ibid.,* 133) merely directs that the priests genuflect, presumably on one knee.

THE "CHURCHING" OF SEVERAL WOMEN TOGETHER

Question: When two or more women present themselves together to be "churched" after giving birth to a child, may the blessing in the Ritual be given with the prayers in the plural number or must they be repeated in the singular for each individual?

Answer: While the form in the Ritual for the *Benedictio mulieris post partum* presumes that the blessing is given to just one woman and so the prayers are all in the singular number, we see no reason why the prayers should not be recited in the plural number when two or more women come at the same time to receive this blessing. We argue *a pari* from the prayers incidental to the administration of the Sacraments which are said in the plural when the Sacrament is simultaneously conferred on several persons. All the prayers of Baptism, outside of those accompanying rites to be performed individually for the recipients, are recited in the plural when more than one is baptized at the same time. Again, in Extreme Unction, by prescription of the Ritual itself (Tit. V, Cap. 1, 22), only the form of words to be pronounced at the actual anointings is to be repeated for each individual candidate. Likewise, the Ritual (Tit. V, Cap. 6, 8) directs only one reading of the prayers for the Apostolic Blessing *in articulo mortis,* with a change from the singular to the plural when more than one is to receive the blessing. So, in the instance of the "churching" of several women together, the priest need read the prayers only once, making the requisite changes to the plural number. We should retain the singular number, however, in the initial antiphon, *Haec accipiet.* By analogy with the similar ceremony in Baptism, we should have the end of the stole given only to the first woman blessed but have the prayer said in the plural with *Ingredimini, adorate, vobis,* instead of *Ingredere, adora, tibi.* While it is the usual practice to have the entire ceremony take place at the altar railing, this is not in exact accordance with the provisions of the Ritual which directs that the first part of the ceremony be performed *ad fores ecclesiae,* the woman being led to the altar as she holds the left end of the stole, the priest saying *Ingredere (ingredimini),* etc., just as when he brings the candidates for Baptism from the door of the church to the entrance to the baptistry. Naturally, even though the entire blessing be given before the altar, this ceremonial presentation of the stole is not to be omitted, the end being given to the first of the women as the form is pronounced in the plural if more than one are receiving the blessing at the same time.

ST. PAUL AND SEXAGESIMA SUNDAY

Question: It seems odd that the collect in the Mass of Sexagesima Sunday should be one asking for the protection of St. Paul.

What is the connection between St. Paul and this pre-Lenten Sunday?

Answer: The reason for the presence of the prayer invoking the intercession of the Apostle of the Gentiles in the Mass for Sexagesima is no doubt to be found in the fact that the Papal station marked for that day is at St. Paul's Basilica outside the walls of Rome. The place of the station was often a determining factor in the selection of the text of the liturgy for the day. So St. Paul figures prominently in the Mass of Sexagesima. Not only is the collect a plea for his protection but the long Epistle is the summary of his life as recorded in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians and the Gospel tells the parable of the sower and the seed and the Apostle of the Gentiles was a mighty sower of the seed of truth.

William J. Lallou

LOOT FROM ABROAD

Question: Returned soldiers frequently approach a priest with a problem of conscience concerning their obligation to make restitution for objects they brought back from invaded enemy countries, having acquired them by methods which objectively could be classified as looting. Similar problems are presented by persons who have received such articles as gifts from soldiers. What norms should guide a priest in solving such problems of conscience?

Answer: So many varied circumstances could enter into cases of this nature, that only general principles can be given. In the first place, if a soldier took property belonging to civilians—watches, cameras, fountain-pens, books, etc.—without making any recompense, and knew at the time he was doing wrong, he may not keep the property. For, in such a case he is a possessor in bad faith, and may not profit by his acts of injustice. If it is impossible to restore the objects to those who were robbed (as is usually the case) he must contribute these articles (or their equivalent in money) to pious causes or to the poor. It is well to note that this principle applies even in the event that the articles in question were taken from a deserted house, since the inhabitants of such a dwelling are presumed to have left it only temporarily and not to have given up their claim to their possessions.

However, it is possible that a soldier took the goods of civilians in such circumstances that he did not realize he was really stealing. Perhaps he had the idea that it was permissible to keep what he chanced to find in a bombed building, and consequently was guilty of no formal sin when he acquired articles of value in this way. In the supposition that there is no hope of getting the objects back to their true owners, the soldier could now keep them, for he has been a possessor in good faith. The same is true of personal possessions, such as watches, money, medals, etc., taken from dead enemy soldiers. Strictly speaking, there should have been an effort to identify the dead man (from his "dog-tag") so that these possessions could be sent to his relatives. However, if a soldier took them without any such effort, with the idea that he was allowed to acquire the articles for himself, he could now be allowed to keep them (presuming that these articles bear no marks whereby the family of the dead soldier could be located). It might seem strange to imply that Catholic soldiers could have been in good faith in regard to looting, but amid the excitement of war and the widespread laxity regarding the rights of the foe, such a condition could have been fairly frequent.

Those who receive articles as gifts from returned soldiers can presume that they were honestly acquired unless they have positive reasons for suspecting the opposite. If they have grounds for suspicion, they should not accept the gift, until they have made some effort to discover if the donor acquired it honestly, and if they find it was not so, they should refuse to accept the gift. If they accepted it with the realization that it may have been stolen property, they are doing wrong; and if later they discover that it was dishonestly acquired, they too must give it up—to pious causes, if the original owner cannot be found. However, if a person has accepted such a gift in good faith, and only subsequently becomes aware that the soldier who gave it to him had seized it as loot, he may keep it, unless he can find the real owner—which, in most cases would be impossible. For, in such a case, he is in a situation similar to that of one who finds a lost article and cannot find the owner.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Analecta

The two latest numbers of Vol. XXXVII of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* published by the National Catholic Welfare Conference contain references in congratulatory letters of our Holy Father to the centenary of Cardinal Newman's conversion[1] and to the seventh centenary of the First General Council of Lyons (1245).[2]

The letter relating to the conversion of Cardinal Newman is addressed to Most Rev. (now Cardinal) Bernard Griffin, Archbishop of Westminster and is dated April 12, 1945. Our Holy Father praises the outstanding quality of Cardinal Newman's life, the quest for Christian truth, the more noble in that the quest was not for purely natural truth, noble enough in itself, but for supernatural truth. In this, he is held out as a model not only for the Catholics of England but for all who are of kindred soul even though outside the Church at the present time. The Apostolic Blessing is conferred on the hierarchy, and on all the faithful, of Britain.

The letter relating to the seventh centenary of the First General Council of Lyons is dated June 10, 1945, and is directed to His Eminence, Peter Cardinal Gerlier, Archbishop of Lyons and Vienne. Our Holy Father praises the hospitality of the city which in that earlier day received the Pope, exiled from Rome, and enabled him to hold the Thirteenth Ecumenical Synod to defend the papal prerogatives. Our Holy Father also refers with appreciation to the zeal with which the French, under the leadership of their King, St. Louis IX, responded to the call issued by the Council for the promotion of a crusade. The Supreme Pontiff expresses the confidence that the same zeal and fortitude will enable the Frenchman of the present day to meet its pressing problems with a truly Christian heart. Finally, the Apostolic Blessing is bestowed on the Cardinal, his flock, and all who attend the celebration of the centenary.

The plight of France is shown to be in the foreground of our Holy Father's mind in three other documents published in the pages of the official organ of the Holy See: a letter to the Cardinals and the hierarchy of France, dated the Feast of the Epiphany, 1945;[3] a radio message to the representatives of the million families consecrated to the Sacred Heart gathered in Paris on June 17, 1945, to observe with solemn ceremonies the hundredth anniversary of the Apostleship of Prayer;[4] and a letter, dated July 14, 1945, to Charles Flory, President of "Semaines Sociales," in anticipation of their convention at Toulouse.[5]

---

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XXXVII (1945), 184.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 204.

A similar concern for the miseries of Poland is apparent in two documents: a letter to Ladislaus Anders, Prefect of the Polish military forces in Rome, dated Jan. 27, 1945;[6] and a letter to the hierarchy of Poland, dated June 29, 1945.[7]

In similar vein one finds our Holy Father's solicitude expressed for the sufferings of Holland in his letter to the Archbishop of Utrecht, Most Rev. (now Cardinal) Jon de Jong, dated May 12, 1945.[8]

All these letters are characterized by the imparting of the Apostolic Blessing, after they have recited the sympathy which our Holy Father felt for the afflicted during the time of the oppression. His constant prayers for them, he assures them, were offered in lieu of the material resources which his all too scanty reserves made it impossible for him to supply. Hope for the future, however, rings throughout them all, with a warning that the times are apocalyptic, calling for the expenditure of the utmost zeal guided by the employment of the best talent available. The power inherent in membership in a Church with the pure doctrine of Christ and the highest moral standards, as well as in the interior graces that flow through the Church and its Sacraments should make of the Catholic everywhere a leaven for the restoration of the world according to the mind of Christ. In the letters to the hierarchies of France and Poland, special reference is made to the need of opening the seminaries and of training new candidates for the ministry according to the best traditional standards, with a view particularly to their adequacy for the special problems of the current time.

The thread of the times is also taken up by our Holy Father in his Allocution of Aug. 15, 1945,[9] to the women members of the Christian Trade Unions of Italy, in which he recognizes that the times have made the presence of women in industry a fact, no matter how much it may be deplored. In spite of this, however, the Catholic mother must remember to use her leisure to supply to the religious and moral life of her family the opportunities of which industry deprives it. The unmarried women are urged also to devote their leisure to home life rather than to the pleasure and the independence to which their position in industry might easily tempt them. Our Holy Father refers in the Allocution to the desire of the Church for a living wage for the head of the family adequate to the support of the whole family, a wage which would make unnecessary the employment of women in industry. He notes also that women's wages should not be less than the wages of men, because if they are, not only the women suffer in the diminution of their income, but the men also, in unemployment resulting from the hiring of the women who serve at a lower cost. Our Holy Father commends the influence for good which the Christian Trade Unions have exercised in the labor movement, while he emphasizes the fact that the Church is the friend of labor, a fact which is made apparent in countries, as the United States, Canada, and England, in which she is not prohibited by adverse political pressure from the exercise of her benefactions in labor's behalf. It is only in countries in which she has been violently coerced that her enemies can pretend that she is unfriendly.

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 180.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 189.

[5] *Ibid*, p. 210.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 183.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 205.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 212.

Two congratulatory letters are published: one, dated July 7, 1945,[10] to His Eminence, Elias Cardinal Dalla Costa, on the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination; the other, to Most Rev. (now Cardinal) Clemente Micara, Titular Archbishop of Apamea in Syria, Apostolic Nuncio to Belgium and Internuncio to Luxembourg, dated July 9, 1945,[11] on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his consecration.

By Apostolic Letters of July 5, 1945,[12] our Holy Father constituted St. Alphonsus Liguori a principal Patron of the city and Diocese of Agrigento in Sicily, along with St. Garland, their previous Patron.

Apostolic Constitutions establish the Diocese of Edmunston in Canada (Dec. 16, 1944)[13] from territory previously belonging to the Diocese of Bathurst, and raise the Prefecture Apostolic of

---

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 208.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 209.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 202.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

Chumatien in China (Nov. 9, 1944)[14] to the dignity of a Vicariate Apostolic.

The Sacred Roman Rota publishes new regulations for the Studium (the school for training advocates equipped to practice before it), substituting these for the rules of Dec. 21, 1911.[15] They provide for a three-year course, with annual examinations, and a final examination, under the direction of a Moderator and Sub-Moderator, subject to the Dean of the Rota.

Decrees for the introduction of causes of the Servants of God have been issued by the Sacred Congregation of Rites in two cases, both under date of March 23, 1945: in the case, namely, of Luigi Balbiano, a secular priest who remained an assistant all his life by preference;[16] and in the case of Philip Jeningen, a Jesuit professed of solemn vows.[17]

Under date of Aug. 21, 1945,[18] there are recorded the appointments made by the Sacred Consistorial Congregation of Most Rev. William Scully, D.D., to the Titular See of Pharsalus, and of Most Rev. John Tracy, D.D., to the Titular See of Metelis, the former to be Coadjutor with the right of succession of the Diocese of Albany, and the latter, with similar rights in the Diocese of La Crosse.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

---

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 201.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 219.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 221.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 218.

PIUS X ON THE PRIEST'S MEDITATION

Among those who fail to "consider in the heart" or who look upon mental prayer as a burden, there are some who, though aware of the consequent spiritual atrophy, excuse themselves on the plea that it is manifestly to the advantage of others that they should be wholly taken up with the distractions and cares of the ministry. They make a sad mistake; for, not being accustomed to commune with God, when they speak to others of Him, or try to instruct them in the truths of Christianity, the Divine Spirit breathes not through them and the Gospel, in their hands, seems almost without life. Their voice, however striking, prudent and eloquent it may be, is not the voice of the Good Shepherd, to which the sheep hearken unto their salvation; it is but empty noise and passing vanity.

—*The Letter to Catholic Priests.*

Book Reviews

PILLARS OF THE CHURCH. By Theodore Maynard. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1945. Pp. xi + 308. $3.00.

This new publication by the well-known author of *Mother Cabrini* consists of twelve condensed biographies of representative figures in the life of the Church. We cannot speak of twelve hagiographies because one of them, Coventry Patmore, the Catholic poet of the Victorian age, is neither a saint nor a candidate for beatification. The twelve biographies are the following: St. Benedict of Nursia, St. Patrick, St. Bede, St. Dominic, St. Louis, St. Thomas More, St. Teresa of Avila, St. Francis Xavier, St. Philip Neri, St. Vincent de Paul, Coventry Patmore, and Blessed Francesca Cabrini.

The author confesses that it was hard to keep his Pillars down to twelve and that his biographies were first used for the Heywood Broun Memorial Lectures. These circumstances may explain to some extent the choice of his subjects and the form in which they are presented. Excluding the apostolic and the patristic age as well as all the Popes, "for Peter is the Rock," the author's choice was made with an eye on nationality and special epochs in Church history. A kind of unity is attained by this arrangement, a unity which is more remarkable because of the contrast of the characters and of the times in which they lived. These twelve Pillars, especially the eleven Saints, make vivid, informative, and inspiring stories. Mr. Maynard loves contrasts and is not averse to paradoxes. The human element and the divine in the lives of the saints are often placed side by side. We may add that the human frailties of his Pillars are sometimes stressed too much, whereas their virtue and spiritual development are either taken for granted or do not receive sufficient consideration. The marvelous works of charity of St. Vincent de Paul, for instance, are not easily understood after the detailed narrative of the young Vincent's ambition and unscrupulous deed: "I suppose the transaction did make him [St. Vincent] a kind of horse thief, and his procedure in Marseilles was hardly that of a saint: he had the debtor arrested and thrown into prison so as to compel him to disgorge" (p. 229).

The author himself does not like Coventry Patmore very much: "The man Coventry Patmore is not one that I particularly like" (p. 246). He does not go out of his way to make him particularly likeable in his biography. He succeeds, however, in attracting the attention of the reader to Patmore's crude mysticism and in arousing his admiration for the convert's burning of his mystical masterpiece *Sponsa Dei* when he learned that it would hardly meet with Catholic approval.

The author must be congratulated for this new addition to Catholic hagiography and for presenting to the hero-worshippers of our generation the wondrous deeds of eleven Christian heroes and heroines whose lives were light for all future generations.

PASCAL P. PARENTE

FURTHER DISCOURSES ON THE HOLY GHOST. By Lester M. Dooley, S.V.D. New York and Cincinnati: Frederick Pustet Co., Inc., 1945. Pp. x + 212. $2.50.

This work, a compilation of discourses selected from the pens of many well-known preachers and teachers, is a worthy sequel to Fr. Dooley's *Discourses on the Holy Ghost,* published in 1942. The compilation embodies twenty-five discourses, twenty of which are adapted for adult auditors; the remaining five for children. The authors of the respective treatises, save one Madame Surles, R.C., have been recruited from the diocesan and religious clergy.

The abiding presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church, Christ's Mystical Body, and in the individual Christian soul, constitutes the twofold theme of the symposium, each contributor applying these basic doctrines to the several aspects of Catholic doctrine and practice, with which they are inextricably woven. From the doctrinal aspect, the Holy Ghost is aptly presented in His relationship with the Church, the Sacraments, the Blessed Mother, the Christian soul, endowed with divine Life, together with all the concomitant faculties, fruits and habits, etc. And from the practical aspect, the Holy Ghost as the specific object of Catholic devotion, His influence on youth, vocations, international peace, etc., are treated with great effectiveness and care.

That there is a definite need for such works one can hardly gainsay. Works of this kind translate the Catholic teaching of the supernatural life into practical terminology, and present to the Catholic priesthood, religious and laity a tangible appreciation of grace in its meaning, mechanics, effects, and possibilities. The Holy Ghost is the Sculptor Divine, human nature is the raw-material of which saints are fashioned, while the human will is the chisel to be used in the process. The Sculptor is without peer; the raw-material has unbounded possibilities, while the flaws in the finished product can only be explained by the lack of co-operation on the part of the human will. In presenting our teaching *De Gratia* the use of figure, picture language, simile and metaphor can be used with great effect, and to this fact Fr. Dooley's latest contribution bears eloquent witness.

EDWARD F. DOWD

NOTE STORICO-BIBLIOGRAFICHE DI ARCHEOLOGIA CRISTIANA. By Monsignor B. Ferretto. Rome: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1943. Pp. xii + 484.

Monsignor Ferretto, professor of archeology in the Pontifical Lateran Seminary, in which post he succeeded the illustrious Professor Marucchi, in this work publishes the notes of the lectures given to his students during the past eighteen years. The work is a history of the development of the study of Christian antiquity from the attention which began to be paid to inscriptions in the fifth and sixth centuries to the scientific investigation of the monuments of primitive and early medieval Christianity of our own day, especially after the impetus to such studies given by Giovanni Battista De Rossi in the mid-eighteenth century.

The term archeology is shown to be of comparatively recent date, of only a century and a quarter ago, as the technical word to indicate the study of antiquity, whether classic or Christian, *antiquitates* being previously used to designate the material studies and *antiquarius* to describe what we now call archeologist. The formal object of the study of Christian archeology is the reconstruction of the thought and religious life of the primitive Church, extended usually through the middle ages to the beginning of the modern era. The study of the ancient places of worship, of the mortuary monuments, the pictures and mosaics, and the inscriptions, which constitute the material object of the science of archeology, furnished witnesses of the faith of olden times and the practice of it by early and medieval Christians and thus contributes much of apologetic and liturgical importance.

The beginnings of archeological studies are seen in the collections of inscriptions, *Syllogae,* dating from the sixth, perhaps even the fifth, century. Next, in chronological order, are the accounts of pilgrimages to holy places, churches and burial sites of Apostles and Martyrs. Such are the *Peregrinatio ad loca sancta,* of Silvia, or Aetheria, and the *Itinerarium Antonii Placentini,* both narratives of pilgrimages to the Holy Land. There are medieval descriptions of Roman basilicas and lists of the places of sepulture of early martyrs, eminent among which is the *Mirabilia urbis Romae,* of the twelfth century. Later, the names of Petrarca, Cola di Rienzo, and Giovanni Dondi indicate progress of the interest in Christian antiquity. It remained, however, for the humanistic movement of the fifteenth century to develop enthusiasm for a knowledge of old Rome, pagan and Christian, and to found, with Pomponius Letus as its *pontifex maximus,* a Roman antiquarian society, the *Accademia Romana,* which despite its pro-pagan beginnings and its repeated suppressions and revivals, exists today, with pontifical approval from the time of Pius VII to the present, the reigning Holy Father having been Cardinal Protector of the *Accademia* before his election to the chair of Peter.

The casual discovery of the catacombs on the Via Salaria, in 1578, opened the way to the direct investigation of the monuments of antiquity rather than the mere study of its literary remains. The Dominican, Alfonso Ciacconio, the layman, Filippo de Winghe, and the Cardinal, Cesare Baronio, are representative of those who first brought to light the interesting discoveries as the catacombs were more diligently explored. Space does not allow us more than the mere mention of Antonio Bosio (1575-1629) whose researches added so considerably to the knowledge of *Roma sotteranea*. Passing over the illustrious names of Mabillon, Ciampini, Bianchini, and other archaeologists of the seventeenth century, and their fellows of the following century, we come to the fathers of the scientific study of Christian antiquity, Fr. Marchi, S.J., and his more famous pupil, Giovanni Battista De Rossi. These archeologists of the mid-nineteenth century gave critical attention to the significance and the classification of the remains of primitive and medieval Christianity and may be said to have intiated a school, which numbered such illustrious scholars as Orazio Marucchi, Msgrs. Anthony de Waal, John Peter Kirsch, John Wilpert, Louis Duchesne, and Fr. Alfred Louis Delattre.

The final chapter of Monsignor Ferretto's book, which as a whole is mainly concerned with Roman monuments of Christian archeology, treats of discoveries outside of Rome but within the confines of the ancient Roman Empire, including North Africa, Asia Minor and Syria, and western and central Europe, so that we have accounts of such famous inscriptions as those of Abercius and Pectorius as well as descriptions of basilicas and baptisteries, which speak of a flourishing Catholic life in countries which later fell victms to Mohammedan conquest. The final pages of the book contain an up-to-the-minute survey of the recent accomplishments in the field of Christian antiquities, represented by the publications of the Pontifical Archeological Institute, the discovery of previously unknown Christian cemeteries in Rome, the new excavations in the Lateran Basilica, and the most recent important finds which resulted from the operations undertaken in the Vatican Basilica, under the reigning Pontiff, Pius XII.

The present work is to be distinguished from handbooks of Christian archeology, like the classic manual of Orazio Marucchi, in that it is a history of the development of the science of archeology, in which the description of churches and baptisteries, of pictures and mosaics, of inscriptions and sepulchral remains, is incidental to the account of the scholars who brought to light these remnants of early and fairly early Christian life. The book, as is usual with foreign publications of the sort, is unbound and with uncut pages. It is well printed and abundantly illustrated. Though the language is Italian, the style is simple and offers no difficulty to those who have even a slight acquaintance with the tongue of Dante Alighieri.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

SPEECH MODELS. EFFECTIVE CONSTRUCTION AND EXPRESSION. Selected and edited by William R. Duffey and Aloysius Croft. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1945. Pp. xiv + 291. $2.50.

The principle upon which Messrs. Duffey and Croft base their work is a sound one. No less an authority than St. Augustine (*De doctrina christiana,* IV, 3) advances the opinion that persons of a keen and ardent nature will acquire eloquence more readily by reading and hearing what is eloquent than by a study of the rules of rhetoric. Although that superb Christian orator had in mind individuals more or less gifted by nature, still what he says holds true in varying degrees for all who would master the art of the spoken word. The more general, and oft-quoted, precept of Seneca, "Long is the way of rules, short and effective by examples" takes up the slack in Augustine's dictum and provides a broader justification for the principle underlying this work.

The models or examples selected by the editors cover the widest desirable range. The essentials of oral composition, the forms of composition, and the various kinds of speaking—all are in turn appositely exemplified. The examples of pulpit oratory, in particular, are generous in number and high in quality. The book appears to be unique insofar as the selections are drawn exclusively from Catholic sources; and these sources cover a very wide range, being as ancient as the Old Testament and as modern as Monsignor Sheen.

Although the volume is professedly one of speech models, the principles of speech are by no means ignored. Each speech essential, form, and type is prefaced by a brief explanation of the speech principle which the model is intended to exemplify. These statements of principle are generally clear, accurate, enlightening, and succinct.

On the debit side, one notices a rather arbitrary division of the forms of composition whereby for some unexplained reason *Persuasion* is divorced from the other forms of composition and made to stand apart as a distinct division of the book. The description of the function of *Persuasion* is far from satisfactory, the terms used being vague and uncertain and the resultant concepts anything but clear. The three pages which introduce the section on Pulpit Oratory, while serviceable, leave something to be desired. This is due, perhaps, to the attempt to compress into a short space something about which there is much to be said.

These few strictures, let it be noted, pertain to items that are only incidental to the primary purpose of the book. What the book purports to be, it is: a collection of speech models, drawn exclusively from Catholic sources, aptly exemplifying spoken discourse in its parts, as a whole, and in its types. The book should prove valuable both to professors and students of speech in high schools, colleges, and seminaries; and the interested layman, whether out of school or self-instructed, should derive great profit from its thoughtful reading.

Robert E. Regan, O.S.A.

Christian Denominations. By Rev. Konrad Algermissen. Translated by Rev. Joseph W. Grunder. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1945. Pp. 1051. $7.50.

Fr. Algermissen's book is divided into five parts. In the first he treats of the Christian doctrine of the Church. In the second he examines the actually existing Catholic Church. The third section is devoted to the study of the dissident oriental groups, while the fourth is given over to the consideration of Protestantism. The final portion of the book deals with the problem of reunion.

The first two sections have little if any value. The author's ecclesiology and his Church History are undistinguished. His account of the Church in this country is singularly inadequate. Furthermore, *Christian Denominations* shows something like a vestigial racism. It takes cognizance of the benefits which the Church derived from Judaism, from the Romans, from the Greeks, and from Germanism (p. 122 f.). Apparently, as far as Fr. Algermissen is concerned, other groups, such as the slavic and the celtic peoples, offered the Church no advantages worthy to be recorded.

The third and fourth sections of the book, particularly the fourth, are more acceptable. The reader of *Christian Denominations* will gain a great deal of worthwhile information about the smaller Protestant religious societies. He will also find a fair account of the most important movements for the reunion of Christendom.

Joseph Clifford Fenton

Travail scientifique en disciplines ecclésiastiques. By G. Yelle, S.S. Montreal: Grand Séminaire, 1945. Pp. 130. $1.00.

Works on methodology are helpful in banishing the feeling of "being lost" which is a rather common experience of students undertaking graduate work and scientific research for the first time. Although there are many books on methodology, yet there are relatively few which treat this subject from the viewpoint of research in ecclesiastical subjects. Some of these are out of print; others are only privately printed. Hence, Fr. Yelle's book deserves a welcome as one that fills a definite and practical need, and which at the same time is reliable, and Catholic in outlook and principles.

In the first part (pp. 15-40), the author gives an account of the role of scientific work in the Church. This is based on the celebrated Constitution, "Deus Scientiarum Dominus," on the *Ordinationes* of the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, and on other Papal pronouncements that stress the import and value of scholarship and scientific research in the service of the Church. Especially worthy of mention in this section are Fr. Yelle's observations on the nature of scientific work and the dispositions required for it. In treating the hierarchy existing among the various branches of sacred theology, the author brings out clearly the many subjects that are embraced in the one science of theology and rightly insists that the integration of all these is required for the proper formation of the trained theologian. The second part (pp. 41-122) is a practical introduction to the well-known stages of scientific research. After discussing the choice of a dissertation, the author takes up the problems of research (gathering the material, finding the sources); criticism (evaluating the data and sources); and synthesis or composition (arranging the material into a unified organic whole and presenting it in the form required by scientific writings). Finally directions are given for the publication of articles, book reviews, translations, etc.

All in all, Fr. Yelle has succeeded in presenting a good outline on the topic of research in ecclesiastical sciences. It is quite conceivable that professors of the various branches of the sciences of theology could point out other books that could be included, specialized books dealing with their respective fields. Yet it does seem that, from the standpoint of the various subjects, the enumeration of tools of research is quite representative. However, from the standpoint of the language of the works cited, there is a noticeable disproportion. In evaluating a knowledge of languages as a help in research, German merits more than a sixth place (p. 45). Both German and French are rich in tools of research. Therefore, side by side with French works mention should have been made of German works which are of equal, and often of better value. This disproportion is noted from the subject of methodology in general down to the problem of the authentic writings of St. Thomas. All will not agree with the system of mechanics outlined in this book. But then, will there ever be uniformity in this matter?

This is a work from which theological students will derive much profit. Those starting to study this subject will see the sublimity of theology and realize that there are many subjects which they must master if they wish to attain a thorough theological integration and take their place in the world as that kind of a priest envisioned in the pronouncements of modern Popes. Those beginning dissertation work will find that this book not only orientates them properly to scientific research, but also helps them through every stage until the final publication of the thesis.

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.

THE SEVEN SORROWS OF MARY. By Rev. Gerard M. Corr, O.S.M. London: Sands and Co., Ltd., 1945. Pp. 127. $1.75.

This is a Servite book on a Servite theme, but its appeal should be as widespread as is devotion to Our Lady of Sorrows. That devotion began with St. John at the foot of the cross, and it has ever since been part and parcel of Catholic piety. The author aims to show that devotion to Our Lady of Sorrows is "essential for all who would think worthily and truly of Our Lady" (p. 9). It is not "devotionette" of the kind which have only a temporary, and too often merely an emotional, appeal. Since Mary is the Mirror of Jesus, and He is the Man of Sorrows, then we can know her fully only when we know her as the Woman of Sorrows. "Mary could not set joy before her mind as the principal thing, when He chose, as the very purpose of His life, the cross" (p. 12).

The author takes the words of the Scriptures as the guide to the meaning of the traditional Seven Sorrows. The seven chapters of this little book are thoughtful commentaries on the scriptural accounts of the seven famous sorrowful incidents in the life of the Mother of God. Where the Gospels are lacking in details, particularly about Mary's role on Calvary, the author presumes that her thoughts were primarily scriptural, that she saw the sacrifice of the cross as the fulfillment of the prophecies of the Old Testament. The chapters on the last three sorrows, the crucifixion, the taking down of Jesus from the cross, and the burial, are for the most part conjecture, but it is conjecture based on a deep insight into the Old Testament and the prophecies.

This book is a fine little volume for meditation on the sorrows of Mary. Priests at a loss for ideas for Lenten sermons will find in it a wealth of material. The notes in the appendix attest to the author's wide scriptural and patristic background. An index of scriptural passages would make the book more useful for handy reference.

LEO J. COADY

DIFFICULTIES IN MENTAL PRAYER. By Father Eugene Boylan, O.Cist.R. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd., 1945. Pp. xiv + 130. $1.50.

The first edition of this book was published in July, 1943. It was reprinted for the fifth time early this year. This is quite a record for a work that does not promise its readers any material success, but merely explains how to overcome the many difficulties of mental prayer. Two facts seem to have contributed to the popularity of this book. One is found in the nature of its subject: difficulties in mental prayer are a common and trying experience of devout persons and saints alike. The other fact is the form the author has given to the treatment of that subject: it is clear, informative, encouraging, and, above all, true. The author does not follow blind theories nor lose himself in useless speculations. He bases his advices on experience and on the teaching of the saints.

The book is neither an introduction to spiritual life nor a scientific and objective treatise on mental prayer. It is rather an analysis of the nature and ways of prayer from a subjective point of view, the point of view of the person engaged in mental prayer. The author takes the reader through the different stages of mental prayer of both the ascetical and the mystical life, examining one by one the main difficulties met in each case and giving practical advice for overcoming them. This book does not teach how to pray but how to conquer the difficulties of prayer.

The author follows a middle course between those extreme schools of thought that have caused no little confusion and uncertainty in the last generation. He takes a firm stand against the so-called speculative school when he writes: "We are quite definitely opposed to the theory that there is no state of prayer between ordinary methodical meditation and passive contemplation" (p. xii).

Even though the author, himself a religious, has religious foremost in his mind, his work is equally helpful to secular priests, for whom he has a special chapter in his book. In this chapter (XIII, "The Prayer of the Priest"), he does not only insinuate the more prevailing opinion that secular priests belong to a state of perfection of their own, but he goes even so far as to say that "the priesthood actually presupposes that one has already acquired holiness" (p. 64). Dealing with the difficulties of mental prayer in secular priests he gives the following excellent advice: "Many fail in mental prayer for want of a grim determination—it must be grim especially in the case of a priest living in the world, if it is to prevail—never to give up the practice of spending, say, at least half an hour daily in an attempt to pray, *no matter how un-*

successful that attempt may seem to be" (p. 64). We heartily recommend this work to any one who is interested in the great means of salvation and sanctication.

PASCAL P. PARENTE

THE LIFE OF OUR LORD. Confraternity of Christian Doctrine Edition. By Sister Jane Marie, O.P., and Sister Anne Catherine, C.S.J. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1945. Pp. iii + 146.

The work of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in imparting religious instruction to the pupils of our public schools is growing both in intensity and in scope. Less than a generation ago this organization was hardly known in our country. Today, thanks to the interest in catechetical instruction manifested by Pope Pius X, and the provision of the New Code of Canon Law, the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine is established in more than one hundred dioceses. In the famous Encyclical, *Acerbo nimis,* "On Teaching Christian Doctrine," Pius X urged all those having the care of souls, "to found classes for instruction in the truths of faith and in the practice of Christian life for the young people who attend the public schools from which all religious teaching is banned." To assist in this program numerous texts and teaching aids have appeared; they are written to present Christian doctrine to pupils of the public schools for at least one hour a week for one year. The present text on the life of Christ was prepared for these pupils in classes conducted by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

This book offers a method of teaching the life of Christ together with pertinent doctrinal and moral lessons, and the restricted scope of the material is in keeping with the needs of Confraternity classes where *multum in parvo* is demanded. The citations from the Gospels are well chosen and aptly correlated with explanation and commentary. The text is attractively illustrated with reproductions of masterpieces. A feature of the book is the carefully prepared "Aids to Learning" which conclude each chapter. It is to be regretted, however, that the authors did not retain more of the "Problems" found in the larger original text, *The Life of Our Lord,* of which this work is an adaptation. Some of the problems in this text are lacking in virility and need to be more positive and convincing. This, however, will be remedied by the catechist, particularly, for a class of boys. "The Church the Mystical Christ" is the unexplained title of one of the closing chapters. This booklet has many admirable qualities, and will take its place among the many good Lives of Christ which are meeting the test of experience in our weekly Confraternity classes.

JOSEPH B. COLLINS

Book Notes

African Night by Desmond Murray, O.P. (London: Douglas Organ, 1944. Pp. 187) is a small book of short but lavishly-styled essays on the race problem of South Africa. The writer, an English Dominican missionary, discusses many aspects of life on the southern tip of the "dark continent": its brilliant skies and underground riches, its native traditions and its insufferable human misery; the silence and mystery of the veld, the squalor and commercialized vice of the mining towns. Yet all of this is but background for his central theme — the enslavement of millions of natives by a handful of whites, and the social, economic and moral consequences for both victors and vanquished. Fr. Desmond's book is readable and meaningful, yet one leaves it with the impression that a conflict wages in the author's mind. He is at the same time an *alter Christus* gazing out on the race conflict around him through the eyes of Christ, and a white man with a strong feeling of the superiority of the white race over the black. "With regard to the Native," he says, "we advocate here justice, Christian education and civilization according to his increasing capacity, but the privilege of social equality under present and normal conditions is not workable. The Native is not capable of this privilege, nor does he ask for it, and the instinct of the White man is against it." What price civilization!

With the growing literature on St. Augustine, it is encouraging to see works appearing that deal with Augustine's own writings. It is obvious that scholars writing on Augustinism must depend on critical texts and competent translations and commentaries. Ruth Allison Brown in *S. Aureli Augustini de beata vista* (Washington: "The Catholic University of America Press, 1944. Pp. xvii + 193. $2.00) makes a study of one of the Cassiciacum Dialogues which form the earliest extant literary works of Augustine. The burden of the work is concerned with an introduction, translation and commentary. The text is basically that of Knoll in *CSEL*. The author has repunctuated this text in keeping with the English usage, and included additional references to sources and parallels. The introduction discusses the Dialogue as a literary form, and gives a detailed account of the background, occasion, etc. of *De beata vita*. The translation has the advantage of being based on a critical text. The author has striven to be accurate and to preserve the flavor of the original. The commentary is concerned with points chiefly of literary and philosophic interest. At times succint summations of points of theological interest are given. Accurate studies in English on the writings of the Fathers are needed. This book will add greatly to a proper understanding of Augustine's *De beata vita*.

Fr. M. D. Forrest, M.S.C., has presented the story of Mexico's most celebrated priest-martyr in *The Life of Father Pro* (St. Paul, Minn.: Radio Replies Press, 1945. Pp. viii + 118. Nine plates). The book rests upon thorough investigation and gives incidents not presented in any previous English work. These, however, only emphasize the characteristics of Father Pro, as he is already known: light-hearted, clever, and heroically devoted to Christ and to souls. A dull biography of Father Pro would be almost impossible; and despite a certain lack of polish (the author too often steps from behind the scenes, and fails to realize that the anecdotes are so eloquent as not to need anyone's saying "now, here's the point of this little story . . .") the present biography is both gripping and edifying. It sells for one dollar.